

George Tait, of Virginia, now a foreign-service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Maurice W. Altaffer, of Ohio, now a foreign-service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Prescott Childs, of Massachusetts, now a foreign-service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Earl L. Packer, of Utah, now a foreign-service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

G. Frederick Reinhardt, of California, now a foreign-service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

Miss Kathleen Molesworth, of Texas, now a foreign-service officer of class 6 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Sam E. Richardson, of St. Johnsbury, Vt., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Vermont, with headquarters at Burlington, Vt., to fill an existing vacancy.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service:

To be assistant surgeons, effective date of oath of office:

Leonard T. Kurland	Thomas A. Burch
Howard N. Frederickson	James R. Mason
Robert B. Shelby	John J. Antel
Carl A. Boswell	Gove Hambridge, Jr.
William A. Himmelsbach	John F. Bell
Lewis Francis	John G. Robinson
	Andrew L. Hoekstra
	Gordon B. Wheeler

To be senior assistant surgeons, effective date of oath of office:

Milton I. Roemer	Charles R. Hayman
Earl H. Webster	Ira Lewis
Harry E. Malley	Wolcott L. Etienne

Assistant surgeons to be temporary senior assistant surgeons, effective dates indicated:

Robert J. Burleson, January 1, 1946.	
Thomas O. Dorr, January 1, 1946.	
Harold B. Alexander, January 1, 1946.	
Martin J. Ittner, February 1, 1946.	
Marvin W. Evans, February 1, 1946.	
Senior assistant surgeons to be temporary surgeons, effective dates indicated:	
Robert J. Anderson, February 1, 1946.	
Kenneth W. Chapman, February 1, 1946.	
Henry D. Ecker, December 1, 1945.	
Gabriel P. Ferrazzano, February 1, 1946.	
Emerson Y. Gledhill, December 1, 1945.	
Robert Mc. Mitchell, January 1, 1946.	
Robert M. Thomas, January 1, 1946.	
Robert N. Lord, January 1, 1946.	
Carl L. Larson, January 1, 1946.	
Jack A. End, February 1, 1946.	
James F. Maddux, January 1, 1946.	
Mark E. Myers, February 1, 1946.	
Lloyd F. Summers, February 1, 1946.	
Randolph P. Grimm, January 1, 1946.	
Senior surgeon to be temporary medical director, effective February 1, 1946:	
Egbert M. Townsend	
Pharmacists to be temporary senior pharmacists, effective October 1, 1945:	
Raymond D. Kinsey	
Thomas C. Armstrong	

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Frank E. Beatty, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 31st day of January 1943, in lieu of the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARKANSAS

Lamar W. Grisham, Pickens, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

CALIFORNIA

Michael D. Fanning, Los Angeles, Calif., in place of M. D. Briggs, deceased.

ILLINOIS

Clarence M. Sullivan, Glen Ellyn, Ill., in place of N. C. Knapp, resigned.

KANSAS

Raymond J. Renner, Andale, Kans., in place of Frank Batka, retired.

MISSOURI

Orvil T. Hughs, Lucerne, Mo., in place of D. F. Studabaker, transferred.

NORTH CAROLINA

Bonnie M. Godley, Grimesland, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NORTH DAKOTA

Alvin N. Anderson, Marion, N. Dak., in place of Cleo Flugga. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1941.

OKLAHOMA

Clifford L. Hanan, Arnett, Okla., in place of A. J. Woods, transferred.

Homer B. Cluck, Guymon, Okla., in place of A. C. DeWolfe, resigned.

OREGON

Herbert G. Suttle, Noti, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

PENNSYLVANIA

John C. Clouse, Rimer, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

TENNESSEE

Jona R. Clark, Haydenburg, Tenn., in place of T. S. Clark, retired.

TEXAS

Harvey L. Pettit, Bloomburg, Tex., in place of R. E. Brinkley, transferred.

E. Lilla McMichael, Cason, Texas. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Thomas H. McBrayer, Lorena, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

UTAH

Iona S. Draper, Fountain Green, Utah, in place of U. S. Madsen, transferred.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 8 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

Thomas F. Corbally to be register of the land office at Great Falls, Mont.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

J. Watt Page to be State director of selective service for Texas with compensation at the rate of \$7,175 per annum.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENT IN REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Thomas Lovet Smith to be Assistant to the Surgeon General, with the rank of brigadier general, for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance.

POSTMASTERS

FLORIDA

Lawrence H. Raker, Crawfordville.

KANSAS

Alice M. Howe, Mount Hope.
Alvin L. Sparks, Zurich.

KENTUCKY

James T. Linville, Fourmile.
H. Clay Darnall, Hardin.
Earl D. Enlow, Hodgenville.

LOUISIANA

Gladys H. Smith, Holden.

MINNESOTA

Sadie M. Miller, Bigelow.
Henry S. Ness, Holler.

NEW YORK

Elsie B. Henderson, Circleville.
Sherleigh L. Westerdahl, Gerry.
Fannie S. Raymond, Yaphank.

NORTH CAROLINA

Margaret T. Sides, East Spencer.
Irene R. Autry, Hampstead.
Edwin C. Eller, Lansing.
Wayman C. Melvin, Linden.

NORTH DAKOTA

Walter Herman Anderson, Wildrose.

PENNSYLVANIA

Joseph F. Moran, Chinchilla.
Andrew T. Ofsonka, East Vandergrift.
Hugh W. Billingsley, Flourtown.
Leon R. Leddy, Port Clinton.
Almeda K. Francisco, St. Petersburg.
Victor D. Crum, Sinnamahoning.

TENNESSEE

Ida B. Winningham, Allons.
Pearl I. McCamish, Calhoun.
Edward B. Simmons, Westmoreland.

VIRGINIA

Harry B. Jordan, Bedford.
Samuel Washington West, Lynchburg.

WEST VIRGINIA

Luther Lacy Lilly, Coal City.
Okey L. Curry, Ellenboro.

WISCONSIN

Ruth F. Steiner, Clam Falls.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 8, 1946

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father Almighty, revealer of truth and sealer of every holy purpose, where love is, Thou art. O teach us the simplicity and the sublimity of such a life that walks in faith and love, in the spirit of Him who, when He was reviled, reviled not again. Here is the upper air of spiritual aspiration in which there is fellowship of confidence and peace and eager spirits are blended into brotherhood. On this day of Nation-wide prayer for the things that make for peace, O give us high courage for our tasks with sweet remembrances of love and fellowship where complainings and discontents cease. We renew our prayer for our President, that Thy continued care and watchful providence may be over him through the course of his days. Grant that all of us may be made wiser by our mistakes, and stronger by every temptation overcome. In the name of St. Mary's holy Son. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates

the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 6, 1946:

H. R. 129. An act to provide for the barring of certain claims by the United States in connection with Government checks and warrants;

H. R. 1315. An act for the relief of B. Pendino;

H. R. 1464. An act for the relief of Leonard Hutchings;

H. R. 1848. An act for the relief of Max Hirsch;

H. R. 2163. An act for the relief of Charles Zucker;

H. R. 2171. An act for the relief of Solomon Schlertman;

H. R. 2240. An act to credit certain service performed by members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service prior to reaching 18 years of age for the purpose of computing longevity pay, or for other purposes;

H. R. 2270. An act for the relief of Harry C. Westover;

H. R. 2289. An act for the relief of Arnold Mecham;

H. R. 2393. An act for the relief of Elsie Peter;

H. R. 2452. An act for the relief of Sam Kalak;

H. R. 2661. An act for the relief of W. D. Jones and Ethel S. Jones;

H. R. 2724. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Forest Eldon Powell;

H. R. 2728. An act for the relief of R. H. Sindle;

H. R. 2769. An act for the relief of C. Frank James;

H. R. 2963. An act for the relief of William Phillips;

H. R. 2974. An act for the relief of the estate of Bobby Messick;

H. R. 3028. An act to amend the act of August 17, 1937, as amended, relating to the establishment of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area in the State of North Carolina;

H. R. 3046. An act for the relief of Thomas A. Butler;

H. R. 3444. An act to grant the title of public lands to the town of Safford, Ariz., for the use of its municipal water system;

H. R. 3514. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Olga Stanik, a minor;

H. R. 3580. An act to authorize municipalities and public utility districts in the Territory of Alaska to issue revenue bonds for public-works purposes;

H. R. 3614. An act to ratify and confirm Act 33 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1945, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945;

H. R. 3657. An act to ratify and confirm Act 32 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1945;

H. R. 3730. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of West Virginia to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River at or near Star City, W. Va.;

H. R. 3784. An act for the relief of C. H. Brumfield;

H. R. 3940. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to Rensselaer and Saratoga Counties, N. Y., or to either of them, or any agency representing said counties, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Hudson River between the city of Mechanicville and Hemstreet Park in the town of Schaghticoke, N. Y.," approved April 2, 1941;

H. R. 4249. An act for the relief of Lucy Delgado and Irma M. Delgado;

H. R. 4652. An act to provide credit for past service to substitute employees of the postal service when appointed to regular positions; to extend annual and sick leave benefits to war service indefinite substitute employees;

to fix the rate of compensation for temporary substitute rural carriers serving in the place of regular carriers in the armed forces; and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4932. An act to amend section 9 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, approved December 21, 1928.

On March 7, 1946:

H. R. 854. An act for the relief of Isabel Carlson.

On March 8, 1946:

H. R. 2284. An act to eliminate the practice by subcontractors, under cost-plus-a-fixed-fee or cost reimbursable contracts of the United States, of paying fees or kick-backs, or of granting gifts or gratuities to employees of a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee or cost reimbursable prime contractors or of higher tier subcontractors for the purpose of securing the award of subcontracts or orders;

H. R. 4571. An act to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941; and

H. R. 2348. An act to provide for the coverage of certain drugs under the Federal narcotic laws.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain letters and certain excerpts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted on abolition of military conscription by the Federal Churches of Christ.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on housing subsidies appearing in the New York Times.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5458) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON of Missouri, LUDLOW, O'NEAL, RABAUT, JOHNSON of Oklahoma, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, and DIRKSEN.

THOMAS SUMNER

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1854) for the relief of Thomas Sumner, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$750" and insert "\$1,500."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHRISTOPHER DANCE

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1613) for the relief of Christopher Dance, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$300" and insert "\$50."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN BUCHAN AND LAWRENCE GILLINGHAM

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1615) for the relief of the legal guardian of John Buchan and Lawrence Gillingham, minors, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$4,300" and insert "\$5,850.55."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$1,034" and insert "\$2,294."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. FLORENCE MERSMAN

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3791) for the relief of Mrs. Florence Mersman, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$2,000" and insert "\$1,330."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF MICHAEL J. McDONOUGH, DECEASED

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2483) for the relief of the estate of Michael J. McDonough, deceased, with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. McGEHEE, MORRISON, and JENNINGS.

THOMAS C. LOCKE

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 75) for the relief of Thomas C. Locke, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. McGEHEE, STIGLER, and PITTINGER.

ESTATE OF WILLIAM N. THERRIault
AND MILLCENT THERRIault

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3808) for the relief of the estate of William N. Therriault and Millicent Therriault, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. McGEHEE, HENDRICKS, and CASE of New Jersey.

MRS. S. P. BURTON

Mr. McGEHEE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2487) for the relief of Mrs. S. P. Burton:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2487) for the relief of Mrs. S. P. Burton, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same.

DAN R. McGEHEE,
J. M. COMBS,
JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JAMES W. HUFFMAN,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2487) for the relief of Mrs. S. P. Burton, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill as passed the House appropriated the sum of \$1,000 to Mrs. S. P. Burton for personal injuries and property damage sustained as the result of a collision, on September 17, 1943, on Airline Highway No. 61, near Reserve, La., between the car in which she was riding and a United States Army vehicle.

The Senate reduced the sum to \$500, and at the conference the sum of \$1,000 was agreed upon.

DAN R. McGEHEE,
J. M. COMBS,
JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2487) for the relief of Mrs. S. P. Burton.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALBERT E. SEVERNS

Mr. McGEHEE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2335) for the relief of Albert E. Severns:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2335) for the relief of Albert E. Severns, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by the Senate amendment insert \$2,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

DAN R. McGEHEE,
W. A. PITTINGER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
ARTHUR CAPPER,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2335) for the relief of Albert E. Severns, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill as passed by the House appropriated the sum of \$3,000 to Albert E. Severns for personal injuries sustained as the result of being struck by a United States Army command car near the intersection of First Avenue South and Railroad Avenue, Seattle, Wash., on June 19, 1943. The Senate reduced the sum to \$2,000, and at the conference a compromise of \$2,500 was agreed upon.

DAN R. McGEHEE,
W. A. PITTINGER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2335) for the relief of Albert E. Severns.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF PETER G. FABIAN

Mr. McGEHEE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 1890) for the relief of the estate of Peter G. Fabian:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1890) for the relief of the estate of Peter G. Fabian, deceased, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by the Senate amendment, insert "\$3,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

DAN R. McGEHEE,
E. H. HEDRICK,
JOHN W. BYRNES,

Managers on the Part of the House.

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1890) for the relief of the estate of Peter G. Fabian, deceased, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying report:

The bill as passed by the House appropriated the sum of \$2,423.75 to the estate of Peter G. Fabian, deceased, for his death, hospital, medical, and funeral expenses incident thereto, as a result of being struck by a United States Army jeep in Rochester, N. Y., on June 14, 1944. The Senate increased the amount to \$5,423.75, and at the conference a compromise of \$3,500 was agreed upon.

DAN R. McGEHEE,
E. H. HEDRICK,
JOHN W. BYRNES,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 1890) for the relief of the estate of Peter G. Fabian.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Mr. Earl Godwin over the American Broadcasting Co. network yesterday evening.

Mr. SOMERS of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Progressive Mine Workers of America.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include an editorial and a resolution.

Mr. SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution from the American War Dads' publication of February 1946.

Mr. OUTLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement on atomic energy adopted by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America.

Mr. WICKERSHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a poem entitled "The Army and Navy Forever."

Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a speech made by Jane Chilcoat at a meeting of the 4-H Clubs.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech made by Durward Lyon at a meeting of the 4-H Clubs.

Mr. TIBBOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a communication from the Illinois Lumber and Material Dealers Association.

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one a newspaper article appearing in the Gettysburg Times of March 3, 1946, deal-

ing with Major General Willoughby, a graduate of Gettysburg College, and in the other letters from the Pennsylvania Saw Corp. and the A. B. Farquhar Co., both of York, Pa., dealing with the hardships inflicted upon industry.

Mr. FULTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from Life magazine of March 8, 1946, entitled "Dear Congressman."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made last night over the American Broadcasting Co. system on the Town Hall Meeting of the Air program on the subject What Must We Do To Feed Europe?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio broadcast delivered by him on the subject A Congressional Office in Action.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the king of birds, the State bird of South Dakota, the South Dakota ring-necked pheasant.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in each letters from correspondents.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. COCHRAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Mr. Chester Bowles.

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein excerpts and certain other articles.

THE CASE BILL

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] seems rather optimistic. He is still talking about the so-called Case bill. He would not recognize a cemetery if he saw one. What is the use of talking about the Case bill, or any other bill dealing with labor disputes, when the Hobbs bill, which is more than 2 years old, which in no way restricts labor or unions, which was sent over to the other end of the Capitol, and there lies buried? You can go north out into the hall and you get an odor of some kind as of something dead. I do not know whether it is because of the inefficient burial of that bill or of the grave in which it is buried. Perhaps they did not bury it deep enough. It is about time the other body gave us a vote on the Hobbs bill for a starter and then we could take up other bills with some hope they would be acted upon.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, next Wednesday another bill to provide pensions for Congressmen is scheduled to be considered. How it is possible for Members of Congress to support this bill to provide pensions for Congressmen, after the panning this body got from the the public when the other congressional pension bill was passed, is difficult to understand. So irate were the citizens that Congress was forced to repeal the pension law. This body voted almost unanimously for the repeal.

It was claimed by Members who supported that measure that the public did not understand it. I think the public did understand it, and I am sure they will understand this bill to provide pensions for Congressmen.

A Congressman who has served only 5 years would be eligible for a pension. Should this pension bill pass I could, if I retired at the end of my present term and lived to the age of expectancy, receive a total of retirement payments amounting to \$15,315 at a cost to me of only \$2,500. Pensions become proportionately larger according to length of service.

Surely this is not any part of the contract which Congressmen made with their constituents when they asked for their votes. With deference to those who are supporting this legislation I would be untrue to my convictions and to my duty if I did not vigorously oppose the passage of this legislation. I feel certain that if it is passed and the public learns the truth it will be no less aroused than it was when the other bill providing pensions for Congressmen was passed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Army and Navy Bulletin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a news story taken from a recent issue of the Green Bay Press Gazette.

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include resolutions of the Monroe County (Iowa) Soil Conservation Service.

IT WAS THE HEEL OF THE OLD DEAL UNDER REPUBLICAN RULE WHICH GROUND DOWN SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks ago, on February 15, my genial colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] no doubt imposed upon by the propaganda mill of the Republican publicity staff, made a statement which purported to show a high mortality of small businesses in recent years under the Democratic administration.

Had the gentleman had an opportunity of examining all the facts, I am sure his statement would have been different. I was moved to make further inquiries, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to include as part of my remarks all the figures.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to revert to my previous statement on February 15 that all the business failures of the last 4 years, under a Democratic administration, are just a little more than 10 percent of all the business failures under the last Republican administration, according to figures prepared and published by Dun & Bradstreet, a firm which certainly has no reason for favoring the Democratic administration in publishing its statistics.

Those figures show the following business mortalities under President Hoover: In 1929, 22,909; in 1930, 26,355; in 1931, 28,385; in 1932, 31,822; a grand, or should I say horrifying, total of 109,471.

The same source shows the following figures for Presidents Roosevelt and Truman in the last 4 years: In 1942, 9,445; in 1943, 3,221; in 1944, 1,221; in 1945, 810; a grand total, and I really mean a most wonderfully and hearteningly small total, of only 14,497, or one-seventh of those under Hoover.

IT WAS THE OLD DEAL BOOT

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] made some rather strong statements in the course of his remarks.

I have made many inquiries and have obtained figures which demonstrate conclusively that the small manufacturing industry has felt the repercussions of the New Deal panaceas—

He said. I quote his exact words, Mr. Speaker; I assure you I would not have presented his mixed metaphor in my own time otherwise. He further confused the figure of speech and the issue when he said:

The little fellows who operate on small margins are the ones who felt and are feeling the heel of the New Deal boot.

The gentleman stated that his figures were drawn from the Survey of Current Business of July 1944. I have grave fears that my friend, the gentleman from Illinois, has been furnished only enough of that official publication of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce to become as confused as his metaphors. I

propose to cite all the facts, and more facts besides taken from equally authentic sources, to show that not only was the boot not a New Deal boot, but that it fits the Republican Party with tailor-made perfection.

PROOF IN A NUTSHELL

In a nutshell, here they are, extracted from the Survey of Current Business of July 1944:

First. Compared with earlier prewar years, business turn-over is, to quote, "always and 'normally' of startling proportions."

Second. Owners have found attractive opportunities in war industries.

Third. The draft "has been even more powerful as a deterrent to the entry into business."

Fourth. Shortages of goods and materials were also responsible for the decline among small manufacturers.

Fifth. A very large proportion of the turn-over has involved the smallest firms.

Sixth. If new businesses and business transfers are combined they would almost double the number of discontinued businesses.

Seventh. Discontinued businesses were comprised 95 percent of concerns having less than four employees. This is worthy of note.

Eighth. The authentic statistical records of Dun & Bradstreet show that from 1940 to 1945, inclusive, bankruptcies averaged but 5,027. In 1945 there were only 810 concerns among manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers, construction and commercial service which became bankrupts, the only measuring rod of the state of business conditions, as compared with 109,471 under Hoover.

Of this total of all manufacturers in 1940, 10,600 had no employees; 15,400 in business had only 1 to 3 employees; 500 were in the class of concerns employing 4 to 7 employees; another 500 employed 20 to 49, while 400 had 50 or more employees. Thus, in this 1 year 26,000 out of the total of 27,300 had 3 or less workers.

In detail, here are the figures for the 4 years of 1940-43 taken from the same Survey of Business of July 1944 from which my colleague from Illinois obtained his figures without showing the reasons for the discontinued businesses in these years, which, along with other statements from this survey, put an entirely different light on the actual facts:

FIGURES TELL THE STORY

	1940	1941	1942	1943
All manufacturers.....	27,300	26,400	27,700	23,200
No employees.....	10,600	10,200	10,400	7,700
1 to 3 employees.....	15,400	14,800	15,900	13,200
4 to 7 employees.....	500	500	600	800
8 to 19 employees.....	500	500	500	800
20 to 49 employees.....	100	200	200	400
50 or more employees.....	200	200	200	200

The number of new businesses and business transfers, when combined, exceed the discounted business by a wide margin, two to one in some years. The comparison of these two factors more than offset the business deaths among

manufacturers, as the table readily shows:

	New businesses			
	1940	1941	1942	1943
All manufacturers.....	30,800	33,800	27,500	25,600
No employees.....	11,300	8,900	12,000	6,000
1 to 3 employees.....	11,500	14,700	9,100	11,500
4 to 7 employees.....	4,200	5,400	3,300	4,200
8 to 19 employees.....	2,100	2,700	1,700	2,100
20 to 49 employees.....	1,300	1,700	1,000	1,800
50 or more employees.....	400	600	300	400

	Business transfers			
	1940	1941	1942	1943
All manufacturers.....	18,200	22,500	17,200	17,400
No employees.....	5,400	6,400	5,100	2,500
1 to 3 employees.....	9,000	10,700	8,500	6,600
4 to 7 employees.....	1,700	2,200	1,300	2,900
8 to 19 employees.....	1,100	1,500	1,000	2,200
20 to 49 employees.....	400	1,200	900	2,100
50 or more employees.....	600	600	400	1,200

The business death in these two groups of manufacturers with three or less employees is explained in the Survey of Current Business in this way:

THE TRUE FACTS

(a) Indeed, a large number of recent business deaths have been due, not to the fact that the economic forces of the war have driven entrepreneurs out of business, but the owners have found attractive alternative opportunities in war industries or have been called into the armed services.

(b) The existence of lucrative employment opportunities and the operation of selective service has been even more powerful as a deterrent to entry into business.

(c) Moreover, a comparison of the figures for the war period with those for earlier years indicates not so much that the war has had a devastating effect upon business as that business turn-over is always and normally of startling proportions.

(d) That the rates were as high as shown in a field (manufacturing) usually regarded as relatively stable, is due to the inclusion in the manufacturing group of thousands of small shops and processors having few or even no employees. Included, for example, are small sawmills, printing establishments, cheese factories, custom industries, etc.

MORE CORROBORATION

In other words, it was not the New Deal policies that affected small business adversely but the draft and opportunities for those with less than three employees to obtain more lucrative position in war work than by conducting their own operations.

Even more emphasis on this point is supplied by the statement already quoted that "turn-over is always and normally of startling proportions." We knew that one-man shops numbering 10,600 out of the 27,300 in 1940 are primarily a neighborhood convenience. Their volume and earnings are small, and their owners are most likely to go to war plants.

This is demonstrated in the new businesses and business transfers in table 8 of the Survey of Current Business. As a whole of all manufacturing concerns, there were 30,800 new businesses established in 1940; also 18,200 business transfers which, combined, total 49,000.

They compare with 27,300 discontinued businesses or 21,700 more than the discontinuances. This is described by the Department of Commerce as normal.

ALMOST DOUBLE DISCONTINUED BUSINESSES

The figures for new businesses and business transfers are shown herewith for each of the 4 years in comparison with the number of discontinued businesses for comparison.

	New business	Business transfers	New business transfers combined	Discontinued businesses
1940.....	30,800	18,200	49,000	27,300
1941.....	33,800	22,500	56,300	26,400
1942.....	27,500	17,200	44,700	27,700
1943.....	25,600	17,400	43,000	23,200

As a matter of fact, combined, the new businesses with business transfers, the business discontinuances among manufacturers are wiped out entirely by almost two to one. The new businesses in each of these 4 years are alone far in excess.

TRUE REASONS FOR DISCONTINUANCES

Moreover, again quoting from this same Survey of Current Business, there appear these significant statements:

A very large part of the business turn-over during the war period has involved the smallest firms. This is not surprising in view of the fact that the rates of entry, exit, and transfer normally vary inversely with the size of concern. During the years 1942-43 concerns with fewer than 4 employees (comprising about 82 percent of all firms) provided 95 percent of all discontinuances, 91 percent of all new business, and 90 percent of all transfers.

It is evident at once that most of the wartime decline in the number of operating firms occurred during 1942-43. This was the time of the most rapid increase in our war production. Shortages of goods and material were first becoming acute. Entrepreneurs and their employees were being confronted with numerous alternative opportunities for lucrative war work. The induction of men into the armed forces was proceeding at peak rates.

"OLD DEAL" IS ENEMY OF SMALL BUSINESS

No, Mr. Speaker, it is not the New Deal which is the enemy of small business. It was not under the banner of Jefferson and Jackson, of Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman that the little businessman has been robbed of his hope and substance.

Bankruptcies are the true measures of business conditions. When business is bad failures naturally increase, and so do the total of liabilities involved in the bankruptcies. It was under the Old Deal, the Republican deal, the Grant-Taft-Harding-Coolidge-Hoover deals, that bankers' panics swept the country, bringing tragedy and ruin in their wake, demoralizing the enterprise of the people, absorbing the savings of hardy souls who had the courage to venture into competition with combine and cartel and monopoly fostered and safeguarded by the Republican Party. The number of bankruptcies in this country, as recorded by Dun & Bradstreet over a 52-year period,

reduced to graphic form, show conclusively that the peaks by number and by dollar volume of bankruptcies have occurred under Republican administrations.

BUSINESS PROSPERS UNDER DEMOCRATS

On the other hand, the valleys in the graphs of bankruptcies have occurred under the banner of democracy. Stringent enforcement of the antitrust laws, beneficial measures for loans and research, wise and equitable tax laws, encouragement of individual small enterprise, a stable economy, a constantly but healthfully mounting purchasing power, based on production and consumption and not on stock-market and commodity gambling—these have been the factors under Democratic administrations which have encouraged the safety and prosperity of the little man.

During the 12 years of Republican rule, from 1921 to 1932, inclusive, the number of failures totaled 282,007, according to Dun and Bradstreet. That is an average of 23,500 per year.

On the contrary, under leadership of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman for 13 years from 1933 to 1945 inclusive, the total number of bankruptcies were little more than one-third the tragic Republican totals. Bankruptcies during Republican occupancy of the White House in an average year were 2.4 times as many as those under Presidents Roosevelt and Truman.

BUSINESS LOSSES THREE TIMES GREATER UNDER REPUBLICANS

Measured in dollars, American business—American small business—lost three times as much during the 12 years of Republican catering to special interest as in 13 years of sound Democratic government. Total losses suffered in bankruptcies during 12 years of the Republican reign of big business passed the staggering total of \$7,000,000,000—\$584,392,000 a year.

In the 4 years including 1940 to 1943 taken by the gentleman from Illinois to show the number of discontinued businesses in his vain effort to prove New Deal injury to small business, bankruptcies, the real test of business conditions, continually declined and in 1945 were reduced to the extremely low figure of 810 of all types of manufacturing, wholesaling, retailing, construction, and commercial services. In the 6 years of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman 1940-1945, the bankruptcies were as follows:

	Number	Liabilities
1940.....	13,619	\$166,684,000
1941.....	11,848	136,104,000
1942.....	9,445	100,763,000
1943.....	3,221	45,389,000
1944.....	1,221	29,378,000
1945.....	810	30,395,000

NEW DEAL BUSINESS SAVIOR

I am confining myself in these remarks, Mr. Speaker, to the problems of small business—the firms which employ only a handful of hands, or which are one-man businesses. It would, therefore, be irrelevant to explore the benefits to all business from the wise measures of the past 13 years, to go into any de-

tailed discussion of loans from Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to fiscal policies which helped save the world from total prostration, to all the measures devised to repair the ravages of 12 years of Republican misrule and favoritism and scandal.

It is no exaggeration to say, however, Mr. Speaker, that the New Deal has been the savior of business, big and small.

Few of us knew, and fewer still now remember, the dangerous closeness of a complete break-down in our Government and our economy in 1932. The people were tragically desperate. Now they are prosperous and happy.

Not all the highly paid economists of the Republicans, no matter how they may distort and falsify the figures, can prove anything except that the United States has now the highest degree of prosperity in all history. I call upon my colleague to disprove these facts.

FOREIGN LOAN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

On March 1, 1946, I sent to the Congress a "Statement of the Foreign Loan Policy of the United States Government" prepared by the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems. I have now received from the National Advisory Council a report on its activities during the last 6 months.

This report, which describes the manner in which the Council is discharging its duties of coordinating the foreign financial activities of the Government, should be considered by the Congress together with the previous statement of policy.

The report is attached hereto.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 8, 1946.

HAROLD B. ALDEN AND WALTER E. STROHM—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 1489, "An act for the relief of Harold B. Alden and Walter E. Strohm."

The purpose of this bill is to pay the sum of \$350 to Harold B. Alden and the sum of \$500 to Walter E. Strohm in full settlement of all claims against the United States for compensation for overtime work performed by them as civilian employees of the United States Military Academy during the period from January 17, 1942, to December 1, 1942.

Section 1 of the act of October 21, 1940 (54 Stat. 1205), authorized the payment of overtime compensation to such professional and subprofessional em-

ployees of the War Department as should "be designated from time to time by the Secretary of War."

It appears that since prior to January 17, 1942, Mr. Alden and Mr. Strohm have been civilian employees of the United States Military Academy, that their services to the Academy have been "professional" in nature, that commencing January 17, 1942, they performed overtime work, but received no additional compensation therefor until December 1, 1942, when all professional employees of the United States Military Academy became entitled to extra compensation for overtime work in accordance with the provisions of the act of December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1068).

It further appears that Mr. Alden and Mr. Strohm were not designated by the Secretary of War as professional employees of the War Department entitled to receive overtime compensation under the act of October 21, 1940, and they did not come within any of the classes of civilian employees of the War Department which were designated by the Secretary of War prior to December 1, 1942, as entitled to receive such overtime compensation. The Comptroller General has held that employees of the War Department were not entitled to receive extra compensation for overtime under the provisions of the act of October 21, 1940, unless they clearly came within the provision of the statute specifically granting overtime compensation.

Undoubtedly the wartime demands of a nation upon its employees, as well as upon all of its citizens, are exacting, resulting in many instances in personal inconvenience and sacrifice; but for the Government to compensate all individuals who have suffered inconvenience and sacrifice as a result of the war would be impossible, and to attempt to provide such compensation through special legislation, such as this bill attempts to do, would commit the Government to an impracticable policy. There were many civilian employees of the Government other than those of the War and Navy Departments who, during the period of hostilities, were engaged in work directly connected with the war effort and who worked many hours overtime without receiving any compensation therefor. For the Government now to attempt to compensate employees of the War Department for overtime work performed by them when they were not designated in accordance with law as entitled to overtime pay would be inequitable and not in keeping with the public interest. I am, therefore, constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 7, 1946.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal; and, without objection, the bill and the message referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the

House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 40 minutes.

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL—FISCAL YEAR 1947

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5605) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate may continue for and be concluded in 2½ hours.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand the gentleman from Georgia does not have many requests for time, if any. I have quite a few requests.

Mr. TARVER. I do not have any requests for time at the moment. As I explained to the gentleman, if I should have any requests for time, I will endeavor to accommodate my colleagues as far as I can.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman expect to read the bill today and finish the bill tonight?

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman is just as well informed on that subject as I could be. I have no knowledge as to any pending controversy of any considerable magnitude.

I hope it may be possible to do that, but the action of the House with regard to offering amendments and the amount of discussion had with reference to them are matters that cannot, of course, be determined by me.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I was asking primarily, because there are two special orders in which some of us—at least I—are interested, one being that of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] and the other that of the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS]. I wanted to hear those if they were going to be used today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5605)

making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, during the years of the war our farmers, just as any other American citizen, did the best that they could and produced some of the greatest crops ever gathered from the fields. They did this in spite of the several million farm boys going into the armed services. In spite of the lack of much needed farm machinery and in spite of higher costs all along the line for everything they had to buy, the patriotic urge to do their part for our country during the war and to back up their sons and nephews in the service resulted in the harvesting of the two greatest crops on record. Even with those great crops we are today scraping the bottom of the bins to find extra food for starving peoples throughout the world.

On September 23, 1942, in an address to the House, I pleaded for the recognition of production of food as an essential industry, equal to that of any war material.

May I quote from that speech of 3½ years ago here today:

Did you ever stop to think that food is just as necessary to the winning of this war as is almost anything, except manpower, that you can mention, tanks, guns, planes, or munitions? Have you momentarily paused and thought of what may come to our beloved Nation in a few years time if too much farm labor is stripped from the farms, if experienced farmers continue to be taken in the draft, if dairy cows and brood sows go to the slaughter pens rather than to remain on the farms to further our production? We have plenty of food today. How about tomorrow? Meat rationing is already on the way.

I have here, Mr. Chairman, 42 auction notices gathered from 1 week's issue of my district's newspapers. Forty-two sales that means the dispersal of herds of milk cows whose butterfat our Nation needs so badly today. Forty-two sales selling hogs and sheep because of farmers having to quit farming. Does this appear as a future promise for the production of the food we must have for our armed forces, our civilians, and our Allies? Does this seem to indicate that all is well with the granary of America? To me these numerous sales spell disaster.

Mr. Chairman, was I right in September 1942, when that statement was made to the House? Have we not seen our people go without butter and meat simply because the production of food was not designated by this administration as being essential?

Too much farm labor was taken from the farm, and too much of our small supply of farm machinery was sent abroad; 18,000 of our farm tractors going to Canada alone in 1 year while our own farmers pleaded for them so that they could replace their worn-out machinery. Today strikes by union labor have done irreparable harm to the production of farm machinery. UNRRA is shipping out a good deal of our farm

equipment and our returning veterans are unable to again get started farming because of these conditions. Let me read you a letter from a veteran in southwestern Minnesota:

I was forced to sell all of my farm equipment when I entered the Army in May 1942. I was discharged February 12, 1946, after having seen over 22 months' service in the European theater of operations, from Normandy to Germany. When I returned I found my fields in weeds and everything else in a general run-down condition. It will require considerable work with good equipment to get the place back into shape, and I must have the equipment to start plowing as soon as weather permits. I cannot work this farm without good equipment. I have covered almost every implement dealer within a 50-mile radius and all I have succeeded in getting is indifference and even sarcasm. This so-called veterans' priority system appears to be a joke. In two instances I learned of opportunities to buy used machinery. Upon investigation I found these implements to be 8 to 9 years old and in practically hopeless condition, yet the prices asked in some cases ran 35 to 40 percent more than the current prices on new equipment. In all cases the prices were far more than the stuff was worth.

The equipment vital to operate this farm this year includes a three-plow tractor, a three-bottom plow, a two- or four-row corn planter with fertilizer attachment, a two- or four-row cultivator, a 15-foot disc, and a four- or five-section drag.

I am not asking for a hand-out. I have some means and, within a reasonable price range, I can pay for these implements. I definitely do not want to throw those hard-earned dollars away on junk. All I ask is a chance to earn my own way. It is realized that I am not the only veteran having troubles, but it strikes me as being criminal to let 240 acres of good land lie idle because of lack of equipment.

It is disgusting to hear and read all the tripe and prattle coming from our politicians about the great sacrifices of our soldiers; talk doesn't raise crops or produce anything tangible. My experiences in combat were not pleasant, but I do not regret or begrudge the 4 years I gave to the service. Surely it is not unreasonable to want to get to a self-supporting basis.

What will this Congress do to remedy problems such as this?

Today we find consideration given by the armed services to the release of football and baseball players. Men can get out of the services to get back into business and professional lines. How many of you Members of this House have been able to secure the release of any farm boys needed desperately by their fathers to help them continue to produce food? Case after case of hardship on the farm has been presented by me to the War and Navy Departments for consideration. No; production of food is not essential until we are faced with the facts that the winning of the peace is based now, after the war, on food. A loaf of bread today to some starving person in Europe will bring more friendship back to America than can a thousand promises.

Many of us have urged the establishment of one food authority. That has been ignored by those in power and we have gone from one emergency in food to another. One year too many hogs are produced, the next year we have a meat and butter famine, and now the administration suddenly wakes up to the fact that millions will starve

throughout the world unless America tightens its belt and shares with them what we have.

We will reap the whirlwind, Mr. Chairman, the whirlwind of distrust in the program as seriously contemplated for agriculture by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. I was amazed to learn that our Department of Agriculture has within it a group of people who feel that the best that our Nation can promise to our farmers is competition in our own markets for a world price on farm products, and then to lock to the Treasury for a hand-out at the end of the year to give to agriculture so-called parity.

Let me quote to you from the hearings just completed by our subcommittee on agriculture, and you can see what I mean by this whirlwind of distrust which will envelop the Nation's farmers unless we here today apply the scalpel and cut out of this appropriation bill funds for theoretical and impractical thinkers in positions of high authority. Let me read it to you:

Mr. DIRKSEN. So if we reach that point in 1947, or beyond, where we have a surplus to deal with, and where we have exhausted every possibility that you can see at the moment to relieve the situation, and prices still continue to tumble, then next it would be your suggestion—not necessarily yours, but the suggestion has been made to let the level of prices on the domestic market go down to what may be the same thing as world market.

Mr. TOLLEY. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And then subsidize the producer of agricultural products out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. TOLLEY. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is your feeling.

Mr. TOLLEY. That is one of the suggestions.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Did that suggestion emanate from your Bureau?

Mr. TOLLEY. We have given thought to it. I think I have already stated here that we have analyzed the consequences of the situation you refer to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is it a fair question to ask you whether or not the Secretary of Agriculture has indicated his reaction to that kind of a program, either publicly or privately? Or is that a fair question to ask you?

Mr. TOLLEY. I would rather you ask him that. We have discussed the matter with him, and with a group of other leaders.

Mr. TARVER. May I interrupt for a question right there?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, Mr. TARVER.

Mr. TARVER. Is it not a well-known fact that the Secretary of Agriculture at Anderson, S. C., and Memphis, Tenn., and at other points, has heartily endorsed the idea of having agricultural products go at the world price, with a subsidy to farmers from the Treasury to make up the difference in their income? You know that to be the fact do you not?

Mr. TOLLEY. I read his speech; yes.

Mr. TARVER. There is no controversy about that. I do not see how there could be.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Dr. Tolley, has the plan been seriously considered, when at some time in the future we may come to grips with the so-called farm problem, of letting the prices go down to the world level; has that been seriously entertained as a part of our own economy?

Mr. TOLLEY. That is a hard one to answer, when you say seriously. We have given, yes, we have given serious consideration to it ourselves; and I know that other people have.

Mr. Chairman, in fairness to the Secretary of Agriculture, I want to state that he personally has refuted any intention

of foisting any such program upon the American farmer. I fear, however, that he may be over-ridden by certain men who have more authority in policy making than he has in this administration.

We must have for agriculture, not a defeatist program as seriously studied by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, but a constructive forward-looking program, which will hold up farm commodity prices, union labor wages, and give a decent scale of living for all of us here in America.

I am fearful, however, Mr. Chairman, that the Secretary cannot put into effect a program, even if he wishes to do so, designed to give real parity to the farmer. The CIO wants and is receiving raises all along the line for union labor. The CIO wants cheap food, wants the lid held tight onto the cost of living, but at the same time through strikes enforces its demands that its 40-hour-per-week members must receive more for their labors than it is willing to grant to agriculture for its 80-hour week. The CIO wants class legislation, and is fostering hatred between agriculture, labor, and industry. A CIO official publicity asserted 2 years ago that 25 cents per pound for butter was as much as farmers should receive.

This administration is kept in office by the CIO and the left-wing elements of America, who we saw just yesterday listing the majority of Congressmen as saboteurs, just because we wanted a workable housing bill enacted and not one that would superimpose on the American people an additional bureau with Gestapo powers.

If the farmers of America are ever compelled to strike, as do the CIO, without compunction, God help America and the starving nations dependent upon her for food. Steel workers, auto workers, farm-equipment workers may strike; farmers, never.

This administration refuses to accept the Brown bill, which would force the computation of parity so as to include the cost of farm labor. How can my farm produce corn, wheat, hogs, and cattle at a profit if I do not receive a price for those products which at least represents the 65 cents an hour or more my farm labor costs me? The farmers of America produced the food to win the war. They did not receive an equal break with union labor and industry. They, however, were producing for their country in its hour of need. Now they demand equality of treatment. Twenty-five million people on farms, 18 percent of our population, received last year 9½ percent of our national income. That, according to Secretary Anderson, seems to be fair treatment. He testified to such belief before our subcommittee. He also has testified before a Senate committee that the 65 cents per hour minimum for others is fair.

Shall these farmers now be rewarded by a program of defeat, a program forcing the 6,000,000 farmers to sell their corn in Chicago alongside of Argentine corn, their wheat in Buffalo in competition with Russian wheat, and their butter and dairy products in the same market as products produced by cheap foreign labor? Yes; that is a beautiful picture very strongly hinted at by the Bureau of

Agricultural Economics for the future of agriculture. The rosy tint painted on the edge of that dark cloud of defeatism is the coming to the Treasury of the United States each year for a hand-out to secure a doubtful parity. These free traders forget that Congress never could and never would appropriate the billions necessary to give our farmers real parity. That parity must be obtained in the market place and not out of the Treasury.

Union labor gets its wage on our own markets out of the sale price of the products produced and industry has always, and always will, get its profit in our own market places. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics and any who might hope for cheap food in a high-wage market are barking up the wrong tree. One segment of our people cannot prosper if some others do not. That is not our American way of life.

May I quote further from my speech to the House 3½ years ago:

The farmer does not begrudge labor a square deal, nor does he resent seeing industry profit on its investment. No reasonable man or woman will argue against permitting the farmer to include the cost of his farm labor, whether it be his or his family's labor, or hired labor, when figuring parity any more than he would begrudge decent pay and working conditions for union labor or a fair recompense for professional men. How can the farmer ever compete for labor nowadays if he cannot obtain sufficient for his products to justify the wages farm labor demands?

Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of Agriculture, the representative of the farmer in the Cabinet, has appeared before a committee of Congress, and has expressed his approval of the 65 cents per hour minimum wage for those outside of agriculture. Surely we all want that but, personally, I feel that the time has come for our Secretary of Agriculture to demand for the farmers of the Nation parity based on that same wage; at least he is advocating for other labor. Food production is the only answer today to starvation throughout the world. An adequate and a fair price will bring forth that production from the farms of America—the theory of the impractical dreamers and leftists will kill that production—take your choice.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to my friend from Iowa, the greatest agricultural State of the Union. The gentleman's personal sacrifice in this war is respected by the House.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Does not the gentleman feel that America owes an everlasting debt of gratitude to the farmer for his patriotism and his continuing to produce food under present conditions?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I believe the farmers of America, next to the servicemen of America, will go down in history as being one of the most patriotic groups in the country. A good portion of our armed services came from the farms and their fathers and families backed them up the best they could by long, hard hours of work.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to one of the best friends that farmers have in Congress—a man who knew first hand in 1917 the problems of the servicemen.

Mr. JENSEN. Would the gentleman care to tell the House what he believes to be the purpose of the economic and social planners and what their ideas are in advocating that the prices of American farm products go down to a world level and then pay subsidies out of an already bankrupt Treasury to make up the difference between the world market price and parity prices? I have my own ideas about it, but I would like to hear the gentleman express his ideas.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I will be frank and tell the gentleman what I think is the underlying purpose of this. I believe every man in the House who reasons for himself and is not dictated to by any group knows the plan. My friends, it is simply because a certain group wants a regimented economy in this Nation of ours. They want the farmers of the Nation to come for a hand-out eternally and forever to the Treasury of the United States so that they, the particular party in power, can continue in their domination of the political set-up in the country. They will not allow our products to bring their lawful prices in our markets, but we must, as in the case of butter, get a subsidy to be paid later on by our grandchildren in taxes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. Does not the gentleman believe as soon as the checks stop coming to the American people from the Government that the party that has been subsidy-minded all these years will then lose their stock in trade and lose the appeal which has kept them in office for too long?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Many farmers, thousands and millions of farmers, who object to subsidies are forced to accept them; otherwise, they would not get a decent price for what they produce. That is the hole that I, myself, am in as a farmer. I voted against these subsidies, but nevertheless I have to depend on subsidies on my butterfat in order to get what I should, a fair and decent price for butter. Certainly the time will come, and at least I hope it will come shortly, when the farmers may expect to get a fair price for his produce in the market place, just as union labor does and everybody else does. Two billions a year in subsidies, which consumers today should pay, will amount to six billions, including interest before these bonds are paid.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, during the war we had to have subsidies in a great many cases.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It was essential in certain lines, yes; especially in critical materials, for high-cost production cost of copper and such metals.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes. But at the present time is it not a fact that the farmers would rather have a fair price in the market place without subsidies. Is that not a fact?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Two years ago I appealed to the Office of Price Administration for a rise in the price of butter.

Mr. JENSEN. May I interrupt the gentleman to say that I am not talking about payments for good soil-conservation practices.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I understand. The gentleman and I have always supported AAA and hope to see soil conservation made a permanent policy in our Government.

Mr. JENSEN. That is a different issue. I am talking about subsidies to be paid out of the Federal Treasury for a number of things.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Including butter, for instance.

Mr. JENSEN. I am talking about the payment of subsidies, not only to farmers, but to everybody else. I am speaking of subsidies that are not necessary. Certainly, we cannot continue that practice for long under present conditions.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I again state that over 2 years ago I appealed to the Office of Price Administration to permit the price of butter to go up on the market to a decent price so that sufficient butter would be produced. But OPA considers its wisdom superior to that of any producer of needed commodities. In that all-wise way of theirs, they refused to permit a price increase and said that the price per pound was sufficient and that the farmers would produce butter in quantities sufficient to meet the demand at that price. Was OPA right? We know the answer to that. Every housewife knows there has not been sufficient butter produced. That same thing applies to work clothing on the farm. The gentleman from Iowa and I have both appealed to OPA to permit the producers of overalls, work gloves, and underwear for children to receive a high enough price so that they could furnish them at a small profit to the retailers in our districts but without avail. Consequently, through this blundering on the part of OPA, there are a great many children in my part of Minnesota, where the weather has been 20 below zero, who have not had warm clothing to wear this past winter. Such actions by OPA bring it into disrepute; no butter, no work clothes, no children's clothing, just regulations by the basketful.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, the gentleman must remember that if OPA adjusts its prices so that the producers of everything could stay in business and make a little profit, we would have such a large production of everything that there would be no use for controls.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Certainly. That is why they are fearful of releasing these controls. Production alone is the answer to inflation.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, they live on control and power.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Any bureaucratic machine thrives on power. The only cure for such a condition is defeat at the polls. Our people give the power and likewise they can, if they see fit, take that power away.

Mr. JENSEN. One more thing. We know that the national economy is always

seven times that of the farm income. The gentleman belongs to a group, and is very active in that group, that has been making a study of the ups and downs in agriculture and in national income. I am a little proud to say that I am also a member of that group that has been making that study.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I believe the gentleman is referring to what is known as the Wilkins plan. Our group, as he knows, has held several meetings on that subject the past few weeks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Iowa has been one of the leaders trying to secure consideration of that plan, which is not a defeatist plan but, on the other hand, is one which would give not only to the farmers but to every segment of our American society a fair and square deal and a just share of the national income.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman. The farmer only asks that he can have the maximum use of our own great market. The gentleman from Minnesota and I both realize the tremendous market to farmers in our own country for automobiles, fridges, radios, farm equipment, and untold other items which can be built for them by union labor at a good wage. All the farmer wants in return is a parity price for the food he produces for the rest of America.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. RIZLEY. Of course, I want to commend my colleague from Minnesota, whose reputation in this House is well known as being one of the able and vigorous champions of the farmers and of agriculture in general.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman and feel that he, in his capacity as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, has been one of the best friends of the farmers in Congress. I wish there were more like him.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman comes from a State that produces a great deal of corn. I do not have too much corn in my State. I noticed a little statement in the newspaper this morning that I think is quite disturbing, and it is quite a serious charge, particularly against the farmers who produce corn for commercial purposes. I call this to the attention of the gentleman to see if he cares to comment on it:

NYLONS GIVEN FARM GIRLS TO LURE CORN TO MARKET

Congress learned yesterday that in one Corn Belt area nylon hose were distributed to farmers' daughters to induce their papas to sell some corn.

Clinton P. Anderson, Agricultural Secretary, told the House Banking Committee of the incident in relating that most grain for hog and cattle feed is "changing hands in the black market or in other unorthodox ways."

As I understand it, the Secretary was up there yesterday testifying in connection with the extension of OPA. Un-

doubtedly this charge he makes is a very grave charge to bring against the farmers of Iowa, Nebraska, and the entire Farm Belt, that they are handling their corn through the black market or in unorthodox ways. Would the gentleman care to comment on that?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Personally, I feel that the Secretary must have secured the wrong information. It has never come to my knowledge in my district in Minnesota that there is any black market whatsoever in farm products. The farmers in that region are too patriotic to indulge in that sort of a practice.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the corn which is being distributed in the black market referred to by the gentleman from Oklahoma probably is that type of corn in which Oklahomans specialize which is sold through commercial channels in liquid form.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Measured by gallons rather than by bushels.

Mr. MUNDT. I would not be surprised, because it goes back to the old slogan, "Wine, women, and song." The farmers of Minnesota, South Dakota, and Iowa who raise the corn are selling it through legitimate markets and through the ordinary outlets. After it is sold by them it may get into unclean hands, but for that they cannot be held responsible.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RIZLEY. I wish to say to the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from South Dakota that the gentleman from Oklahoma made no such charge or no such claim against the farmer. I merely quoted an AP dispatch which purported to quote a statement made by the Secretary of Agriculture in which he is alleged to have said that the farmers in the great Corn Belt had indulged in these practices.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think the gentleman will agree with me that before making any such statement as that the Secretary should be sure of his facts, before casting reflections on a great people engaged in a great industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I enjoyed the colloquy between the gentleman from Minnesota and other Members from the Farm Belt. I hope at some future time we can have a forum at which we can discuss these many vital matters pertaining to agriculture. It is most proper that we should be discussing the agriculture appropriation bill at this very time when the farmers of America are again being called upon to produce food for the Nation and a starving world. It seems strange that only in times of emergency does the farmer receive the proper recognition due him. At most other times in our national economy he is shoved into the background. After all, agriculture is the basic industry in this country. The production of food was never recognized as a war industry dur-

ing the war effort. In spite of it all the farmers went forward during the war and accomplished unbelievable results under very adverse circumstances. Now once again they are called upon to produce food to relieve a shortage that threatens starvation all over the world. The farmer is the victim of the elements at all times, and has learned long ago that he cannot be dependent alone upon labor and machinery to do his job. In my own home community in the spring of the year the farmers of many denominations gather together in their churches to pray for a blessing on their efforts and for a bountiful harvest. Their prayers have not gone unanswered. There are many commendable provisions in this bill and I am sorry a limitation in time prevents me from referring to all of them.

I am particularly pleased with the new appropriations made in this bill for the Extension Service, which will provide additional 4-H Club workers in the field. It is my understanding that a great number of these workers are going to be engaged in the work of the 4-H Clubs, one of the finest things in agriculture today. I am glad to note that we are really getting down to the business of doing something for the boys and girls on the farm. There are some 3,200,000 of them in the United States, 1,590,598 of whom as of 1944 belonged to the 4-H Clubs in America. May their tribe increase. It is highly essential that such steps be taken to keep youth on the farm and to keep them interested in farm life. It is somewhat discouraging to note that many of our farm boys coming back from the service are not inclined to go back to the farm and something must be done to combat that trend. The only way I know of is to make farming more attractive.

The 4-H Clubs are doing a magnificent piece of work in making better farmers and better citizens.

Much can also be said about the flood control provisions in this bill. I am very much interested in the appropriation of \$4,280,000 for the Little Sioux River flood-control project in my congressional district, located right in the heart of the food belt of this country. Flood waters in this territory have caused damage considerably in excess of one-half million dollars each year by the washing away of valuable farm crops. I therefore am pleased to see that an appropriation is now being made to go forward with a remedial program which is so long overdue.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I am very pleased also to see this amount placed in the appropriation bill and funds made available for flood control and soil conservation of the Little Sioux River Basin. This project extends into my district also.

Mr. HOEVEN. The gentleman has cooperated with me in bringing this project to the attention of the Congress. The appropriation will permit us to go forward with the over-all program which has been long in the making and is now actually coming into being.

I also want to mention the appropriation made in this bill for soil conservation. It is the coming thing in this country. Our people in Iowa are now becoming educated in soil conservation and they have been made to realize that throughout the years we have been using that beautiful black loam indiscriminately without putting back into the land those things that are so vital to the production of crops.

I also note that there is an appropriation in this bill of \$250,000,000 for REA loans. In 1935, 10.9 percent of the farms of America were electrified while last year, 1945, 55.3 percent of the farms were electrified. Progress in the extension of this service has been most remarkable. The day is not far distant when every farm in America will be electrified, which is exactly as it should be in this modern day and age.

Mr. Chairman, I want to devote the balance of my time to saying something about the shortage of farm machinery, which so vitally affects agriculture.

American farmers desperately need new machinery and equipment. During the past 4 years they have accomplished one of the greatest production jobs of the war—and they have done it without the tools and the labor such as the Government provided so lavishly for other war industries.

Farmers themselves made their magnificent accomplishment possible, by putting in 80 to 100 hours a week on the job and by patching up and wiring together old machinery which could not be replaced or even adequately repaired.

Now, both the men and the machines are tired. Farmers have driven themselves through 4 years of harder work than most city folks can even imagine. Much of their antiquated equipment has squeaked and wobbled its last possible trip around the field.

What are their prospects of getting new machinery this year, to take some of the back-breaking work off their own shoulders, to replace equipment which simply will not run through another planting and harvesting?

I think our farmers deserve an honest answer to that question. Here are the facts as I have been able to dig them out of confusing and sometimes conflicting reports and statements—and the outlook is bleak.

The Department of Agriculture asked for a minimum increase in production of farm machinery of 30 percent in 1946 over 1945 production. Manufacturers hoped to increase production approximately 50 percent.

Neither goal will be realized. Even under the most favorable conditions, it is now obvious that we will be lucky to get even as much production in 1946 as we had in 1945. It is equally obvious that favorable conditions are not going to prevail in the farm machinery industry for the next several months. Strikes, material shortages, and price difficulties must be ironed out before production can proceed at its fullest.

Because of the uncertainties of the situation no one, either in industry or Government, is willing to hazard a guess as to the actual quantity of tractors, plows, and harrows which will be pro-

duced this year. The best sober judgment is, however, that it will be considerably smaller than 1945.

In this connection, it is worth noting that the 1945 production of new farm machinery was not sufficient ever to replace the machines which wore out during the year.

Strikes are the major factor now retarding production of farm machinery. Strikes are in progress at three of the biggest plants—International Harvester, J. I. Case, and the Oliver tractor works. These, of course, affect production directly.

Equally as serious, however, are the effects of the steel strike. There was a shortage of steel sheets even before the strike in the steel industry started. This shortage has now become critical and production in many small farm-machinery plants is tied up because of scarcity of material.

This condition will not be remedied overnight. It will take from 1 to 3 months after steel plants resume full operation for the steel which is holding up production of farm machinery to reach many of the plants that are waiting for it.

It will take even longer for steel to reach the hundreds of small manufacturers who do not buy their steel direct from the mills, but from warehouses. The warehouses will have to be filled first before the equipment manufacturer can get all he needs.

The fighting war is over but the farmer's war job is not done. Food is a munition of peace as important as guns are to war. All-out production by American agriculture is going to be as essential in 1946 as it was at any time during the war. Are American farmers going to be asked to do this war job again without the labor and without the tools they need?

For more than 2 years the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee has pleaded with the administration to classify food production as a war industry—give it priorities on labor and machinery with which to do its war job. Last April the whole Republican conference of the House joined in this appeal.

From every farming section of the country now come grave warnings that such action is still necessary. Farmers and their machines are worn out. Farm labor is unavailable or demands such high wages that it cannot be employed. Young farmers are not returning to the land from the armed services and from war industry. Those who are closest to the soil warn us that food production may fall far below our goals this year unless the farmer gets help. The help he needs most is new equipment.

There is no reason why this equipment cannot be made available. The Nation that astounded the world with its war production can meet agriculture's desperate need for tools if it wants to do it. There is not more important job facing the Federal Government.

The Republican Congressional Food Study Committee, therefore, renews its appeal that the administration undertake at once a determined and adequate construction program to provide American farmers with the tools they need to

do their job—the job of feeding the people of this country and helping to prevent starvation throughout the world.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, as this bill comes from the committee it carries, according to the statement on page 1 of the report, approximately \$1,103,000,000 in all. That includes direct appropriations, reappropriations, loan authorizations, transfers, and all that sort of thing. There are a great many things in it that are probably required by the condition of agricultural production in the country. On the other hand, there are included in the Budget estimate 3,200 so-called man-years of additional jobs. This means when you come to translate it into terms of the numbers who will be employed, probably 4,000 or 5,000 additional people on the pay roll.

There are a great many activities in the Department of Agriculture like the Bureau of Agricultural Economics where they are doing things that are absolutely unconscionable. For instance, there has very recently been sent out to the farmers a questionnaire asking all kinds of foolish questions about the acreage, the cost, and the farmer's method of acquiring title, questions that could be of no possible value. For instance, they want to know how many years the farm has been in a particular family, whether the farm was acquired by purchase or inheritance, how many other farms the man has besides the one he operates, and a lot of questions that have no particular value. This kind of business indicates that they must have too much money available or they would not be sending out these questionnaires.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Is it not a fact, and I believe the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] can bear me out, that this bureau has even gone to the length of having reports sent in as to the race question and the prohibition subject? What has that got to do with agriculture?

Mr. TABER. They have overstepped the bounds about as far as they can. This is apparent from the things they have done and the capers they have cut. They have so much money available to them and so much personnel lying around loose doing nothing that they absolutely ought to be curtailed considerably even from their present activities.

There are three or four other items about which I want to say a word. The Farm Security Administration has a group of people in every agricultural county of the country. These people are running around annoying the farmers to death, soliciting loans. I have seen this operation repeatedly myself. I know that it is a terrific waste.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. There are also a great many farm credit activities supported by

the Department of Agriculture. All of those ought to be consolidated, and we ought not to have this duplication. An agency was up before the Deficiency Committee the other day. It is in charge of those loans to farmers on drainage and local irrigation and things of that sort. In each State office they have two or three people. The average total amount of loans made by each employee individually was about \$15,000 and the average of each loan was about \$1,500. That meant 10 loans in the course of a year per employee in these offices, which is a perfectly ridiculous figure, to maintain an office to lend that amount of money with that sort of overhead. There are so many other things in connection with it that call for criticism along that line that I think there should be a general survey of the Agriculture Department with the idea of finding out where the 25,000 surplus employees in the Department of Agriculture are so that the Congress might pull them out, and I might add that my information comes from sources that I believe are absolutely dependable.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I quite agree with the gentleman from New York that there ought to be a survey of the whole agricultural structure. It is entirely possible that by sending out a chief liaison man for the Department in the agricultural counties and sort of funneling and pipe lining the various activities through him very substantial economies may be made both in respect to the pay roll and the personnel as well.

Mr. TABER. I think that stands out like a sore thumb. Any man who really represents the farmers and wants to see the farmer get what he should and be treated the way he should be treated, must realize he is not doing the farmers any good when he supports 25,000 more people on the pay roll of the Department of Agriculture than ought to be there. There is not any question about that in my mind. A fellow cannot be a friend of the farmer who stands for that sort of thing because the farmers back home do not want it any more than you or I do.

There is another thing I believe I should call to the attention of the committee while I am on my feet. That is the increase of \$42,500,000 in the appropriation for soil conservation and domestic allotments. Insofar as the appropriation for aiding farmers in developing soil-conservation programs and that sort of thing, I am in full accord with that appropriation. I believe it is serving a useful purpose. But I do not believe that these payments which are directly in the nature of hand-outs should be increased above the Budget.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to get this time to speak upon the appropriation for the Department of Agriculture. It was my privilege, through the courtesy of the able chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Illinois

[Mr. DIRKSEN], to sit in at times and participate in these hearings. I know how seriously the committee considered these items.

I think the hearings themselves, composing over 2,000 pages, are a tribute to this subcommittee and direct proof of the serious study they gave to the responsibility this House has committed to their particular attention.

For the main part, all of these appropriations were authorized by the Congress. Some of the items for which appropriations had to be made were not authorized, and it was necessary to bring this bill in under a rule waiving the points of order that could have been made in order that activities of the Department, considered essential, might continue.

I would like to explore, if I may, some of the problems that confront a Subcommittee on Appropriations as they attempt to hold down unnecessary appropriations and maintain the solvency of this Nation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, a member of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Personally, I have had the pleasure of serving with the gentleman for the past 2 years on our subcommittee. I feel that in certain lines of agriculture, especially that which affects his home State of Washington, he is without doubt one of the best-versed men in Congress along those particular lines.

Mr. HORAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the able ranking minority member of this subcommittee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was very happy for the contribution which the gentleman from Washington made. He is a large orchardist in his own right and he is thoroughly familiar with that branch of agriculture. He has rendered yeoman service to the committee in that respect as well as other respects.

Mr. HORAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. As one who had the privilege to travel in the Old World with the gentleman from Washington, I can say to the House and the country, no man on that committee of 11 showed greater interest in agriculture and its problems than the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Michigan. Certainly those questions crying for solution over there have their implications upon our own agriculture and industry. They should be studied if we are to intelligently legislate for the future.

There are some people in this Congress who challenge our capitalistic system. I personally see no better alternative in prospect. Certainly the mere substituting of socialistic monopolies will not serve our free society as well as our time-tested competitive economy. Our

main concern is to keep our society free and our country competitive. To do this we must fully recognize monopolies already granted in the public interest as such, and challenge, not the capitalism upon which our great social system rests, but the threats and controls that menace our competitive system. I say that the greatest threat to our Nation today is insolvency, and the greatest need right now, although it is a dry subject, is a balanced budget. The security of every pension, every annuity, every individual in the white-collar classes who must live within their incomes which are proportionately lower now than they were 10 years ago, since their salaries have not been proportionately raised, every investment, every inventory in the United States; in fact, the security of the entire Nation is founded today upon our ability to maintain the solvency of this Nation. That is simply because only the Federal Government can issue or coin money. The solvency of the Federal Government is the direct concern of everyone who must earn his living through acquiring and disbursing dollars. Let us work to make and keep it an honest dollar.

Our security, then, is based upon two broad factors: the maintenance of full and continuous production, and a balanced Budget.

I know that many men on this Committee on Appropriations, and this subcommittee, have given this matter a great deal of sincere and serious thought. I have heard many, many formulas as to how we might wisely cut appropriations and yet achieve a balanced budget. It has been suggested that we make a straight 25-percent cut in all appropriations coming before this House. Personally, I have been inclined to reject any such proposal. I maintain that any cutting of appropriations should be intelligent and selective.

Take the bill before us now. If we were to make a straight horizontal cut in all appropriations, there are many items in this bill that would be harmed, particularly in the field of research. I think the time is here, in fact, it is long past, when, if anything, we should increase appropriations for research.

So it goes on down the line.

Then, there was another suggestion that has merit, and which has been criticized on factual grounds; that is, to require every department to expend their money on a quarterly basis. This has been opposed—I believe with considerable logic—with the argument that requiring expenditures to be made on an inflexible quarterly basis in a department which because of its very nature had a seasonal bulge in its activity was not an intelligent approach to this question.

The third field which I believe the membership of this House can wisely approach and fully explore is the field of subsidies. I am well aware of what the mere raising of that challenge means.

It is not apparent in the bill before us, but last year for purposes of agricultural production, largely in the field of food, wool fibers, and tobacco, we spent a total of \$2,388,500,000. Only a small portion of that sum is included in the appropriation bill before us. Yesterday we passed a housing bill, and the mem-

bership, I think again wisely, rejected the \$600,000,000 subsidy item in that measure. Some 2 or 3 weeks ago I voted against a ship subsidy bill because I did not feel that at this time we could enter into such a procedure and maintain the solvency of the Nation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York, ranking minority member of the whole Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TABER. The current subsidies that are being paid now would bring the total for agricultural products way above the figure it has been in the past. Is not that correct?

Mr. HORAN. I feel certain that that is so and therefore, I believe it is a field, I may say to the gentleman from New York, that we should explore.

Mr. TABER. We should.

Mr. HORAN. And the House should know absolutely where we stand in this matter. Over in the New House Office Building now the Committee on Banking and Currency is considering a proposal placed before them by the OPA for \$2,700,000,000 to be spent on subsidies. I understand that the Secretary of Agriculture has concurred in this request. Perhaps we should agree—but we must know why.

I believe the time is here when the House should have these figures laid out in the simplest type and form before the membership in order that we may understand what it is that supports our economy and be able therefore to pass wiser judgment. I have not for the life of me—and I have made some effort to obtain them, been able to find out even approximately what our total indirect payments are, subsidies of every type, size, form, and purpose that are filtered and channeled through various controls and bureaus of the Government.

Last fall we passed what many of us at the time thought was a good measure, we passed a tax-reduction bill. As it has worked out, however, we find we have practically subsidized business in this country to the tune of some \$3,000,000,000. Fortunately the Committee on Appropriations recognizes the need for this house to fully know the implications of all these loosely legislated expenditures.

A new subcommittee has been set up under the leadership of the able and distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. It is the Subcommittee on Government Corporations. Let us hope they will fully review and factually report the activities of all these agencies which, today, disburse billion after billion of this Nation's wealth—and, as usual, even before it is produced.

We have got to become alert. In our hands rests the solvency and the future of one of the greatest nations that ever rose on the face of the globe. Alertness and wisdom provide our only salvation and security.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I take this occasion to sound a warning to

veterans, their organizations, and the country as a whole, that the Communist Party of the United States is making strenuous efforts to infiltrate veterans' organizations and to incite veterans against our Government. It will be remembered that the Communists took an active part in the Bonus March of 1932. Speaking of this event, Earl Browder, then general secretary of the Communist Party, declared at its eighth convention in Cleveland on April 2-8, 1934:

The tremendous revolutionary potentialities in this movement was startlingly revealed by the great Bonus March in 1932 * * * The veterans' movement is a most valuable ally to the revolutionary working class movement. It stands as one of the important tasks of the entire party in mobilizing the auxiliary forces for the working class movement in the United States.

Today the Communist Party is even more ambitious. It has already organized posts of so-called Labor Legionnaires within the American Legion. It is steadily infiltrating into that organization, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Veterans' Committee, and other groups. It has established a special veterans' commission to supervise this work. Its first ambitious project shrewdly camouflaged, is a new monthly magazine called Salute, which I propose to analyze in detail.

You will remember that Members of Congress repeatedly called attention to the suicidal policy of the War Department in permitting individuals with Communist records to take control of Army publications. Now the Communists are cleverly exploiting this mistake by announcing that Salute is produced by former editors and writers of Yank and Stars and Stripes. In fact, they have even copied the format of Yank in order to befuddle the veterans.

The first issue of Salute, dated April 1946, follows the Communist Party line to the letter. In What I Think of the Army by Irwin Shaw, he says:

Every time you open your mouth in the Army you feel the entire weight of 9,000 colonels hanging onto the tip of your tongue.

I am sure the Soviet Army did not tolerate any propaganda for democracy to creep into Army publications as we allowed Communist propaganda to be published in our own Army press.

Throughout the publication there is a note of bitter criticism of the American Army fully in harmony with the propaganda issued by Communists in connection with recent demonstrations demanding demobilization. On page 12, we find a reprint of the bonus march of 1932, obviously in preparation for another bonus march in 1946 under Communist initiative.

On pages 16 and 17 we find a number of scurrilous cartoons directed against Army officers.

Richard Watts, Jr., in his article China Gropes for Freedom, espouses the cause of the Chinese Communists and denounces Gen. Patrick J. Hurley.

DeWitt Gilpin, a former writer for the Daily Worker, seeks to enlist the support of the veterans for strikes in his article entitled "Bread and Butter Front." This is in full accord with the policy outlined above by Earl Browder.

Walter Bernstein contributes his Balkan Adventure, eulogizing the Communist Marshal Tito.

Who are the men behind this insidious publication? Let me give a brief history of some of the outstanding figures.

In advance publicity it was announced that the publisher of Salute is none other than Leverett Gleason, who is also known as Alexander Lev, former business manager of Soviet Russia Today, and connected in a managerial capacity with Communist-line publications: Friday, Scoop, and Readers' Scope. For some unexplained reason, Mr. Gleason's name is not mentioned in the first issue of Salute. Other contributors are:

James Dugan, writer for the Young Communist Review in 1939 and 1940; writer for the Communist New Masses; signer of the Call of the League of American Writers for its congress on June 6 to 8, 1941, against "involvement in this war." He was a writer for the British edition of Yank.

DeWitt Gilpin, correspondent for the Daily Worker; discharged as a social worker because of his Communist activities in Kansas City. He was a writer for Yank.

Irwin Shaw, member, Citizens' Committee for Harry Bridges; author of the pro-Communist play, Bury the Dead; signer of a statement defending the Moscow trials. He was a writer for Yank and Stars and Stripes.

Walter Bernstein, writer for the Daily Worker; leading apologist for Marshal Tito. He was an editorial writer for Yank.

A further check-up by the FBI will disclose many more Communist connections than I have given here.

It should be noted incidentally that Max Novack, a contributor to Salute, has just been appointed head of the reemployment unit of the veterans' affairs section of the Claims Division of the Department of Justice. Mr. Novack should either renounce and explain his connection with Salute, or he should be dismissed.

It is clearly the responsibility of the War Department, in justice to the veterans who may be misled by the announced connections of these individuals with official Army publications to inform all former members of the armed forces that it assumes no responsibility for this publication. The veterans of the United States should be forewarned of this insidious hoax.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE].

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in addressing the House at this time is to pay tribute, very briefly, to the accomplishments of one of the outstanding agencies of the Department of Agriculture—the Bureau of Animal Industry. The appropriation requested for the work of this Bureau during the coming fiscal year is not large. Viewed as a dollar-and-cents investment in our livestock and food industry it is good business. It will pay big dividends to farmers and consumers in the form of improved herds and farm products of the highest quality.

The Bureau of Animal Industry and the Meat Inspection Service are constantly at work inspecting animals and food and conducting research and experimentation to insure a healthy and disease-free livestock industry and a steady stream of healthful food to our tables.

Most of you, I know, are familiar with the stamp reading "U. S. Government Inspected and Passed" which appears on the meat you buy. That stamp means that a Bureau veterinarian has found that meat pure, and free from disease-carrying agents.

Housewives who can still buy butter may see on the label of butter wrappers the statement, "This butter is made from cream produced by tuberculin-tested cows in modified accredited areas." This means that State government co-operating veterinarians have tested cattle in those areas until the chances of getting TB through milk or cream are practically nonexistent.

Butter, cheese, and poultry, too, all come under the Government veterinarian's test.

It is impossible in a short time to outline in detail the work being done by the Bureau in meat and food inspection. Bureau veterinarians work in packing houses, in butter factories, in dairies, in warehouses. They even inspect livestock while it is on the farm and before it has been slaughtered for marketing, and carry on from there until the food is sold to us over the counters of our stores.

Perhaps the most spectacular accomplishment of the Bureau has been in the field of livestock improvement. Largely due to Bureau efforts during the more than 60 years of its existence, our livestock industry is the largest and healthiest in the world. Tribute should be paid to the fearless leadership of men such as Salmon, Melvin, and Mohler, who headed the Bureau during its most turbulent years. Several national campaigns against animal diseases were conducted under their leadership considerably in advance of public opinion in many areas. Lawsuits, violence, and even bloodshed marked the progressive application of veterinary science. In more recent years, I am glad to say, public opinion has been highly receptive to these campaigns.

Congress has had a real share in this accomplishment. Lending an attentive ear to legislative needs of agriculture and stock raising, it has served as consulting architect for the upbuilding of these resources. There has been need for a great deal of research—to find improved systems of breeding, to develop more useful types of animals, to test new feeds, to reduce losses, to save labor, and to enhance quality.

Acting in the public interest, Congress has supplied needs of the kind outlined. Livestock production responded accordingly. In some cases the benefits have been measurable with a high degree of precision. Through dairy-herd improvement fostered by research and extension work, production of milk and butterfat per cow has taken a distinct upward trend. The same is true of egg yields in poultry flocks.

Modern types of animals mature much earlier than those raised at the turn of

the century. Good steers now are ready for market within 2 years, instead of 3 or 4. Improved livestock also yield a greater quantity of finished product for the feed utilized.

In the Bureau's scientific research there has been more devotion to achievement than fanfare of results. Entanglements of old traditions and smoke screens of skepticism have sometimes impeded application of the new knowledge, but in spite of obstacles, progress has been continuous. Take, for instance, the painstaking research on worm parasites of hogs and the development of the now familiar swine sanitation system.

The recommendations of the scientists to scrub and disinfect farrowing houses, to wash the sow before the birth of her pigs, and to take her out of the muddy hog lot and put her in clean pasture—all these things at first seemed, to practical folks, like putting pigs in the parlor. But now this sanitary system of raising pigs is the rule rather than the exception. And it is responsible, to a large extent, for the ability of farmers to raise pigs with so few losses.

Let us examine another illustration. Back in 1917 when the national campaign against bovine tuberculosis began, about 50,000 cattle a year failed to pass Federal meat inspection. Instead of qualifying for human food, those animals went for fertilizer, grease, or tannage. By contrast, the number failing to pass inspection in recent years has been less than 2,500—in other words an annual saving of about 47,500 cattle, equivalent to some 24,000,000 pounds of dressed beef.

Thus we see how the Bureau's foresight a quarter of a century ago, plus good organization and courageous effort, is now paying food dividends in a hungry world.

Bovine tuberculosis is just one of several disease enemies now practically conquered. Southern cattle ticks are another, sheep scab is another, and pull-worm disease is another. The Bureau is currently working on contagious abortion in cattle, known as Bang's disease. Milk from cattle which have this disease causes undulant fever in the human, for which there is no known cure.

You can see, therefore, how closely tied up are human health and livestock health.

These are only a few of the many jobs Bureau veterinarians are engaged in. Progress against other important maladies is a matter of public record. Congress, in providing funds for such activities, is performing a real service to agriculture and to the Nation.

As I have said on a previous occasion to my colleagues in Congress, we are now literally holding in trust for the rest of the world the best blood lines now extant for the reestablishment of disease-free herds and flocks in all those war-stricken countries.

Thanks to a vigilant, aggressive Bureau of Animal Industry.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, what about the future for the American farmer? I believe this is the time and place to discuss that important question, because our national prosperity is dependent upon the prosperity of ag-

riculture. We cannot expect to raise the living standards in this country or in the world unless those who work our farms and natural resources are prosperous. My thesis is that farm incomes must not only be maintained, but increased in our effort to secure a balanced and prosperous economy. This is an economic necessity and we must succeed in our attempt to raise the American standard of living.

Mr. Chairman, this country is in the throes of an industrial revolution. We are witnessing the effort of one group to force its demands upon other groups at any cost. Their right to achieve that objective, in a lawful manner, cannot be denied. The affect, however, upon the economy of this country will be far-reaching. There will be calls for increases all along the line—including increases for agriculture. When President Truman some weeks ago authorized increases in wages and said the price line would be held, notwithstanding, he was not forthright with the American people. Events have and will continue to disprove his statement. The time has come as one authority has said, to realize "that each group is interwoven with every other group in an indivisible economy, with each group a multiple of the complete economy of the United States." When one secures an economic advantage over another it throws our economy out of balance and greatly upsets normal levels of consumption of raw and manufactured commodities.

It is a fact and not a theory, Mr. Chairman, that if the man who works in our factories is entitled to increased wages to maintain a high standard of living, which I approve, it is just as necessary that the man who works on the farm is likewise entitled to increased income for his labor. Some reasonable balance must be maintained between these groups. I do not plead the cause of one group as against the other, but I do say, "What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander." It is necessary to understand that there is an interdependence of interest, not a conflict of it. We are told that each dollar of agricultural incomes translates into \$1 for factory pay rolls—for industrial workers—resulting in a total of all groups of \$7 in national income or purchasing power. I am offering for the record at this point a table showing the operation of our national economy covering the period from 1921 to 1938, inclusive:

Year	Gross agricultural income (millions)	Factory pay rolls (millions)	Gross national income (millions)
1921	\$8,900	\$8,300	\$62,300
1922	9,900	9,100	61,100
1923	11,000	11,000	59,200
1924	11,500	10,500	71,900
1925	12,000	10,500	76,500
1926	11,500	11,400	80,200
1927	11,600	11,200	82,900
1928	11,700	11,300	84,100
1929	11,900	11,700	81,100
1930	9,500	9,600	75,400
1931	7,000	7,000	63,200
1932	5,300	5,200	48,800
1933	6,400	5,500	44,200
1934	7,300	6,800	50,400
1935	8,500	7,600	55,800
1936	9,500	8,800	63,900
1937	9,800	9,500	67,500
1938	7,500	7,800	64,100

There is a striking balance between agriculture and factory pay rolls and the national income.

Mr. Carl Wilken has well said these figures indicate approximately \$1 of agricultural income to \$7 of national income. The above table shows income of \$1 for agriculture, \$1 for factory pay rolls and \$7 for national income. With this showing of a definite relationship of agricultural income, raw material income, and factory pay rolls to national income, it seems logical and possible to operate our economy on an actuarial basis the same as life-insurance companies are operated. Mr. Wilken contends that by using the commodity index as a guide we can determine the price for basic materials in direct proportion to the national income required to operate the Nation as a business.

These are important facts, Mr. Chairman, for they show that our economic cycle starts with the production of farm commodities and raw materials. The public has no such understanding. Look about and you will realize that the things you eat, wear, and use have been produced on the farm or came from the mine, the forest, the lake, or stream. When called to our attention, the facts are quite obvious and need no further elaboration. We must remember, then, that this is the starting point; the dollars that operate in our economy start from the bottom with agriculture and percolate up through to the top. Certainly they do not move from the top down, and some labor leaders ought to realize this fact and understand the principle involved, for they should understand that under normal conditions, the farmer purchases 30 to 40 percent of all manufactured products.

Now then, Mr. Chairman, I return to my first proposition that our national prosperity starts on the farm. When agriculture is prosperous, the whole Nation is prosperous. When the farmer, the miner, and the woodsman are receiving an income commensurate with their efforts, then their city cousin who works in the factory or for some service organization will be prosperous. In fact, this is the only way city men will ever achieve full employment in the true sense of that term; he will never achieve it by Government-made jobs.

But what has the farmer been earning? Let us take a look at the record. I have had an opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to examine a table offered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin, the Honorable REID F. MURRAY. These are official figures obtained from the United States Department of Agriculture. This table shows the return per hour to all labor used, total labor used, and total investment of the typical family-operated farm. A majority of the farms in my district, southern Wisconsin, are engaged in the dairy industry. I was amazed to see what farmers were getting per hour for their labor over a period of 10 years. Here are the figures:

1930-----	\$0. 27
1931-----	.04
1932-----	.06
1933-----	.07
1934-----	.09

1935-----	\$0. 32
1936-----	.24
1937-----	.32
1938-----	.25
1939-----	.20

The picture presented, Mr. Chairman, is one that the majority of our citizens will find difficult to believe or understand. City workers will agree that those who labor in agriculture are entitled to more money for their work when they understand that agriculture is the very basis for his own prosperity. This means that the prices we pay for the products of the farm must be increased when subsidies are removed. The hourly return as indicated by the above table gives credit for rent, garden, and other farm benefits. It also includes subsidies received by the farmer. Further, it includes the labor by the owner, his family, and hired help, if any.

In further support of my position in this matter, I bring to bear the testimony of Mr. J. B. Hutson, Under Secretary of Agriculture, before your committee. Discussing the matter of farm income on page 1214 of the hearings, he said:

The income of people on farms now is about \$500 a year average income. The average income of people not living on farms or living off of farms is about \$1,300 a year. We do not believe that with that difference that the people living on farms can maintain a standard of living equal to that of the non-farm people.

This is important testimony and shows the true picture of our farm people and their relationship to the city people, and it is apparent that under these conditions, our economic scale is out of adjustment for the farm group.

Obviously, Mr. Chairman, the great need at this time is to bring industrial and agricultural prices in balance. I leave to the experts the charting of that course. Perhaps there is no unanimity of opinion among them, but we must make a start in that direction. Congress should lend its support to any movement designed to bring about such a result.

Economic problems, however, cannot be solved by enacting laws. This fact is fundamental and has been recognized for centuries. Socialists and Communists may deny it, for they strive to solve every economic problem by legislative fiat. Hitler and Mussolini are present-day examples and so is the Russian experiment. Yet there is a legislative responsibility to assist wherever we can without governmental interference in the operation of our free economy. The free functioning of economic laws is a prime necessity. It is as necessary as the protection of the individual in his endeavor to earn a living—on the farm, in the factory, in his business, or in his profession.

The farmers hold the power of life or death over all the people in this country. Yes, in every country in this world. We live upon the raw materials that are produced in fertile soil. Desert land is unproductive, and we are told that the Holy Land was at one time a veritable paradise. Today, it is bleak and barren, and the people who live there barely eke out an existence. So the modern farmer is charged with a double responsibility. He must produce our food, and in addition, maintain the soil beds that yield the

food. In short, his job is production and soil conservation.

If we are honest in our judgments, we must admit that the farmer is entitled to an income for his work which is comparable to the man who works in modern industrial plants. That is the goal we must seek in order to insure a material prosperity for all of our people.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this particular time to discuss briefly the question of employment, not only in this department, but in other departments of the Government, and the manner in which it has been increased without any effort whatsoever being made to decrease employment in our Federal agencies. Together with other Members who have spoken before me, I want to pay tribute to the American farmers for their splendid efforts and their work during the war period and want to express appreciation of the great responsibility that our farmers are required to assume in the production of crops, not only for food for the people of America, but for starving people in other countries.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. BISHOP. Does not the gentleman think the department heads at the present time would sanction such a move, thereby eliminating a lot of employees?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I want to discuss the question of employment in Government. It has been alleged we have something like 25,000 more employees in the Department of Agriculture than are necessary. Yet, upon reading this report, I observe a request was made by the Bureau of the Budget to increase this agency by something more than 3,000 employees, the committee has cut the 3,000 by one-half—evidently a sort of compromise, was made with the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course, that estimate of surplus is predicated upon the reorganization, in line with what has been suggested on the floor.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The thing I want to suggest, and I have mentioned it many times here, is the time has long passed when some group representing the Congress should get busy and find out how many employees we do need, because it is alleged many times that we have too many employees. We should eliminate this duplication of activity and cut out all activities not necessary in line with the fiscal condition of our Treasury.

This bill asks for 1,500 additional employees. Up to this time, the Bureau of the Budget in making requests for the old-line agencies, outside of the Veterans' Administration, and of course we expect increase in personnel in this agency because we know they will require great additional expansion of employment and should have it. So far as I know we do not have the requests for the so-called war agencies. They

may show reductions when the requests are submitted. Leaving out the War and Navy Departments, the total overall requests—and this also leaves out the Veterans' Administration—show requests by the Bureau of the Budget for substantial increase in 44 agencies reported. There are some small reductions in a few of them, but the over-all picture with respect to these agencies will show requests for more than 100,000 additional employees, as I understand it. That may not seem to be very many compared with total employment, but it does indicate that the Bureau of the Budget, which, after all, is the arm of the administration, has not made much of an effort in asking for reduction of employees in this Government.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thoroughly agree with the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Kansas. I am of the opinion that if the job of reorganizing that and other departments for the purpose of securing the elimination of duplication is done and done properly, it must be done by the Congress in the form of a statute.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, because there is not a single one that I know of among the various agencies that will ask for any reduction in force or for any reorganization that amounts to anything, whereby we not only can economize in employment but more efficiency that is so much needed right now.

Sometime ago I introduced legislation that would put in the hands of the House and the Senate the power to go into the whole problem of employment and find out what employment we do need and what we do not need, and put our Government nearer on a business basis. Of course, we do not run our Government on a businesslike basis. If we should run our business as we run the Government in that respect and a great many other respects, we would go broke immediately.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. As a member from one of the leading agricultural States, as the gentleman from Kansas is, and also as a member of the Committee on Civil Service, I wonder if the gentleman could tell us why these employees of the Department of Agriculture, like PCA, AAA, and employees outside of the top brackets, are not blanketed under any Social Security or Civil Service or have any provision for retirement. Some of them have been working for at least 10 years without any provision for their retirement when they finish their Government service. I would like to have the gentleman explain that situation.

Mr. REES of Kansas. There are a number of people who work for agencies closely associated with the Federal Government who, as the gentleman said, are under neither Social Security or the regular retirement system. They should be under one or the other. The matter is now being examined by a number of

committees of the House, and legislation is pending. I am informed the problem is being studied by the Ways and Means Committee at the present time. The Civil Service Committee also has legislation under consideration on the subject matter. I want to add I appreciate the interest of my colleague in this important problem. He has called attention to an inequality that ought to be corrected.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, in the press a few days ago there appeared a statement by a leading member of the other body and later another statement by the Secretary of State to the effect that we should adopt a firmer policy toward Russia. Tell Russia not to push us around. Today the press carries a statement to the effect that Russia has sent us word to keep our nose out of Manchuria. I wonder if it would be possible for someone on the majority side to tell the American people whether the radio station established in the Pentagon Building during war time on an Executive order and said then to be under the exclusive control of the Russians and still said to be under that control—whether that station is still operating and if it is whether we know what it is being used for, what is the purpose of its use? What is going out and coming in over it. If we can get that information tomorrow I think it will be worth while; be of interest to our people.

Yesterday the House passed the so-called housing bill the purpose of which we were told was to provide homes for veterans, but the House seems strangely inactive when we attempt to provide jobs for veterans or attempt to fix it so the veterans can work when they find themselves a job. We are for the veteran when he does not come in conflict with the administration's political friends, the PAC, the CIO, the UAW-CIO, or the A. F. of L.—when he sees how quickly the administration deserts him.

In the News Palladium, published at Benton Harbor in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, a very, very good newspaper with not quite as large a circulation as the New York Times or the Chicago Tribune, but still with a large circulation, there appears an item headed "Veteran with gun routs strikers." From this article it appears that a veteran, Lawrence Squires, who prior to his enlistment worked for 2 years in a foundry in the city of Grand Rapids, which is in the Fifth Congressional District, represented so ably by our colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN]. After enlisting and serving for a number of years in the armed forces, Squires returned and went back to his old job and became a good union member. Unfortunately, one of his children had died. He did not have any great financial resources. He had some bills to pay, he had the funeral expenses to pay; and so when his fellow-workers in an unauthorized strike walked out and established a picket line, he did not like that and he told them that having these bills to pay he just would have

to go to work. He told them he was going down to work the next day and he was going to bring a gun along with him. The next day he took a 16-gage shotgun and went down and wanted to go through the picket line.

There were 15 pickets who told him he could not go through. Luckily his gun was not loaded, but he did point it at one of them and that fellow dropped to the sidewalk and got out of the way. Then Squires, forgetting that he was back at home and a civilian, that he was no more than a returned veteran, the glamour of whose return had worn off in his local community, had been forgotten by his coworkers in the factory, took the 16-gage shotgun by the barrel and went through the picket line. In going through in some way he cracked the stock of his gun. I am wondering whether the committee could not include in this deficiency appropriation bill an item to buy him a new stock for that gun.

Well, he got through the picket line and went in the factory. Then what do you suppose happened to him there in Michigan? The gentleman from Detroit [Mr. O'BRIEN], on the majority side, sitting here, a lawyer, knows as I do that we have in Michigan a statute which makes it a misdemeanor to interfere with a man who is going to or from his work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I say our law makes it a misdemeanor, a crime, to interfere with a man going to or from his work. After this soldier, exercising his right to go to work, to earn money to buy food and clothing for himself, his wife and one remaining child, went through, as he had a right to do, and it was unlawful to block his way to his work, what do you suppose happened to that man? Lo and behold, the authorities came down and arrested him for assault with a dangerous weapon. But they did not do anything to the 15 who had unquestionably violated the State law, to others in other cities, who had been violating the State statute for several days, and there are hundreds of thousands of violations of that kind in the State of Michigan where the pickets have by force kept the men away from their work.

The point, and the only point I wish to make, is that if under the influence of the Communists, about whom the gentleman from Royal Oak, Mich. [Mr. DONDERO] spoke so ably a few moments ago and about whom he gave us so much information, and those other fellows working inside of the union keep on with their mass picket lines, there will be more and more Squires seeking to go through. You know what the result will be. There will be bloodshed; then we will have a hue and cry from union leaders about men using force and violence when they want to go to work.

If this Congress and the law-enforcing authorities do not protect the right of the returning veterans to work, if they do not protect the right to work guaranteed

to every man by the Constitution, and violence and bloodshed and death follow, we cannot escape our share of the responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

If there are no other requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Forty-five Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 48]

Adams	Fenton	Mankin
Allen, Ill.	Fisher	Morgan
Anderson, Calif.	Flood	Morrison
Andresen	Fogarty	Murphy
August H.	Fuller	Norton
Andrews, N. Y.	Gamble	O'Neal
Auchincloss	Gardner	Patman
Bailey	Gary	Patrick
Baldwin, Md.	Gavin	Peterson, Fla.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gerlach	Peterson, Ga.
Barden	Goodwin	Pfeiffer
Barrett, Pa.	Gossett	Philbin
Barry	Granahan	Ploeser
Beall	Green	Powell
Bennet, N. Y.	Hale	Price, Fla.
Bland	Hall	Rabin
Bonner	Leonard W.	Rains
Bradley, Pa.	Halleck	Randolph
Buck	Hancock	Rayfel
Buckley	Hart	Reed, N. Y.
Bulwinkle	Heffernan	Rich
Burch	Henry	Richards
Burgin	Herter	Riley
Butler	Holmes, Mass.	Rivers
Byrne, N. Y.	Hook	Robertson, Va.
Byrnes, Wis.	Izac	Robinson, Utah
Camp	Jackson	Roe, N. Y.
Campbell	Jarman	Rogers, N. Y.
Canfield	Jennings	Russell
Cannon, Fla.	Kelley, Pa.	Schwabe, Mo.
Cannon, Mo.	Kelly, Ill.	Sharp
Celler	Keogh	Sheppard
Chapman	Kilburn	Sheridan
Clark	King	Short
Cole, Kans.	Kinzer	Sparkman
Cox	Kirwan	Spence
Curley	Klein	Stigler
Daughton, Va.	Knutson	Sumners, Tex.
Davis	Kunkel	Taylor
Dawson	Landis	Thom
D'Ewart	Lane	Thomas, N. J.
Dingell	Latham	Thomas, Tex.
Domengeaux	Luce	Torrens
Drewry	Lynch	Traynor
Durham	McConnell	Vorys, Ohio
Eaton	McGlinchey	Wastelewski
Elsaesser	McGregor	White
Fallon	McKenzie	Wolfenden, Pa.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5605) the agriculture appropriation bill, 1947, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called when 276 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and be submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. General debate having been concluded, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal

year ending June 30, 1947, hereinafter referred to as the current fiscal year, namely:

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to see if we can find out the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to announce the program to the House in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

If this bill is not disposed of today, and we hope it will be, consideration of the bill will be continued on Monday; Monday is District of Columbia day, but I understand there are no bills from the District of Columbia Committee.

After disposition of this bill, H. R. 307, relating to the atomic tests, will be taken up, after which consideration of H. R. 5356, relating to ships for the Republic of China will take place.

On Tuesday, House Resolution 541, providing for taking from the Speaker's desk and sending to conference, the so-called Petrillo bill will be taken up. Thereafter, the second rescission bill which has been reported by the Appropriations Committee will be considered. It may be that I will ask unanimous consent of the House to meet at 11 o'clock on that day, maybe not, according to what time the members of the Appropriations Committee might want on the second rescission bill.

On Wednesday, the House will consider H. R. 4199, the civil retirement bill for Members of Congress, that very just legislation that should have been passed long ago.

On Thursday and Friday, the bill H. R. 2501, relating to Federal rural rehabilitation projects will be called up; H. R. 4512, which amends the Public Health Service, and H. R. 2115, relating to the domestic raising of fur-bearing animals.

Conference reports will be brought up at any time they are ready. There is one that is likely to be ready, and I refer to the conference report on the deficiency bill which went to conference today.

I wish to announce to the House that the Second War Powers Act has been reported by subcommittee to the full Committee on the Judiciary. In the event that bill is reported by the Judiciary Committee and a rule is granted, every effort will be made to bring it up promptly. If the bill is ready and the rule is granted, it may be that I will ask that it be considered Thursday on account of the importance of the matter. I understand from information I have received that the subcommittee has unanimously agreed on its report to the full Committee on the Judiciary, which is always a very good sign and a healthy way to legislate.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Economic investigations: For conducting investigations and for acquiring and diffusing useful information among the people of the United States, relative to agricultural production, distribution, land utilization, and conservation in their broadest aspects, including farm management and practice, utilization of farm and food products, pur-

chasing of farm supplies, farm population and rural life, farm labor, farm finance, insurance and taxation, adjustments in production to probable demand for the different farm and food products; land ownership and values, costs, prices and income in their relation to agriculture, including causes for their variations and trends, \$1,923,457, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such salaries and expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of \$71,150 shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the current fiscal year shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation and the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations: *Provided further,* That no part of the funds herein appropriated or made available to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics shall be used for State and county land-use planning, or for the maintenance of regional offices, or for conducting social surveys.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: On page 11, line 8, strike out "\$1,923,457" and insert in lieu thereof, "\$1,623,457."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, as I previously pointed out in my 30-minute address to the House in general debate, this is one appropriation which I believe could be cut to a certain extent with great benefit to the farmers of America. I say that, Mr. Chairman, because this program, which the Bureau of Agricultural Economics has in mind for the future of agriculture, is simply nothing but a defeatist program. This is the program which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE], as you can see from the hearings on page 251 in his discourse with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], admitted is under serious consideration. I am glad to say that the Secretary of Agriculture disclaims any responsibility for any such program. It is my feeling, however, that we must instill into that particular Bureau the need for very, very careful thinking before they begin to advance such impractical theories as to the future of agriculture in America, and because of that belief I am offering this amendment to take away from them \$300,000 of the particular part of their appropriation which has to do with economic investigations.

The amendment which I have offered, Mr. Chairman, proposes a cut of \$300,000 to be applied as follows: \$100,000 for the Division of Farm Population and Rural Welfare, \$50,000 for the Division of Farm Management and Costs, and the balance of the \$300,000 reduction to the Division of Land Economics.

May I say that the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, in the opinion of many

people, should have its work limited entirely to that which was programed for its original purpose, Mr. Chairman, namely, to assemble, analyze, and publish statistical and economic data with respect to agriculture. These people go far afield when they try to tell you and me and the farmers of America that all we can depend upon for the future of agriculture is the defeatist plan of permitting our products to sink to a world level, and then come to the Treasury for a hand-out to make up the difference between that and parity.

In conclusion, may I read from the testimony of Mr. Edward O'Neal of the Farm Bureau while being questioned by our chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]. I quote from page 1653 of the hearings:

Mr. TARVER. Now, as to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics: I am very much impressed with your testimony in that regard, and with your suggestion that its activities should be confined to statistical and factual research work. According to the evidence which has been delivered before this committee in the last day or two by the officials of that Bureau, they have apparently gone into fields very far different from that and, among other things, they have been largely responsible for the development of a proposed new farm policy, the purport of which is to have the American farmer produce at world price levels, even the part of his production which is used for domestic consumption, and then, if he is sinking, to raise his head above the water by giving him some dollars from the Federal Treasury to enable him to keep going and keep on producing so that the rest of us will not starve to death. Do you think that is a good plan, Mr. O'Neal?

Mr. O'NEAL. Assuredly not.

Mr. Chairman, we hear much from certain people about economy in Government and balancing the Budget. Here is an opportunity to save \$300,000 without doing the least bit of harm to our Department of Agriculture. I hope this amendment will receive the serious consideration of the Committee.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. Chairman, as has been indicated in the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota, there has been no member of our subcommittee more critical of recent operations of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics than I. If that were not sufficiently indicated in the hearings it was, I think, stressed in the remarks I undertook to make to the Committee of the Whole on yesterday. I felt and still feel that the Bureau of Agricultural Economics has gone far out of the field for which it was set up originally and that its extra-jurisdictional activities ought to be appropriately curbed. However, the subcommittee has accomplished that. The subcommittee has by changes in the appropriation language eliminated its authority to make so-called planning investigations of the type which have subjected it to just criticism, in my judgment. In addition, the subcommittee has reduced its appropriation below Budget estimates by \$485,543, representing a reduction below the amount carried in the bill for the present fiscal year of \$454,500. A further reduction, in my opinion, is not justified.

This is a very important Bureau. It is charged with the duty of discharging functions that are of the utmost importance to American agriculture. The fact that it may have exceeded its jurisdiction in some types of investigation and planning that it has carried on during the past 2 or 3 years ought not to cause us to destroy the Bureau or to make it impossible for it to discharge its proper and useful functions. But I think the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, while it would not destroy the Bureau, would certainly hamper it unduly in the discharge of its functions in the collection of statistical and factual information, which I consider to be the functions which it was originally intended to discharge.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman, of course, knows this does not affect in any way the \$2,037,000 we give to that Bureau for the collecting of statistical data and the analyzing of such data. I am not touching that whatsoever.

Mr. TARVER. That is true, but at the same time there are many types of investigation which may be carried on with the funds proposed for appropriation in this item which ought to be carried on and carried on in a proper way, and which if carried on in a proper way would be of vast benefit to American agriculture.

If the Bureau of Agricultural Economics is not being properly conducted or if the head of the Bureau has done things which he ought not to have done in the performance of his duties and gone into fields which he ought not to have entered, that is not in my judgment a reason for destroying or unduly hampering the work of the Bureau. Let us assume that individuals who are in charge of this work will be changed when the necessity for change appears, but let us make adequate provisions for carrying on the functions we think ought to be carried on for the benefit of agriculture in this country. If we do that, I think we will have gone far enough in approving the reduction which has been recommended by the subcommittee which is so considerable in amount. So far as I know, no member of the subcommittee, with the exception of the gentleman from Minnesota, feels we should go further than has been indicated by the subcommittee's action. I hope, therefore, that the amendment offered by the gentleman will be defeated.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota because I am in absolute accord with any and all attempts to cut out many of the expenditures which are being diverted to bureaucratic enhancement and augmentation. I want to point out another serious condition at this time, and that is the overwhelming threat to the dairy farmers of the North-

east in the ghastly shortage they are now facing in dairy and poultry feed. I submit that within 2 weeks, unless some remedy is brought about on the part of the Government or the administration, they will be forced to do away with many of their dairy herds and kill off some of the older stock and allow their cattle to get what sustenance they can upon pasturage this spring and summer. That will mean a reduction in the output of milk in our section. As I have many times said on this floor, the dairymen of the Northeast are the last people in the world to be thought of or considered in the entire Nation.

Furthermore, there are millions of poultry and turkey stock that will have to be killed off unless the dairy and poultry feed situation is improved.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman has always been very interested in agriculture, and as a member of the Committee on Agriculture he has proven that interest. Neither he nor I would do anything to injure the cause of agriculture.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Of course not.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Does the gentleman not agree with me that \$1,623,000 should be enough for this Bureau of Agricultural Economics to play around with in the line of economic investigations?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. It is probably more than they would need. There are plenty of ways that they can spend that money to help out the farmers in the gentleman's district and the farmers in my district and throughout the Northeast generally. They ought to help them to get enough feed for their dairy stock and to help them keep on producing for the city consumers.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Does the gentleman not feel that in coming before the Congress and before the people of America with a request for 3,254 additional personnel above that of last year the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of the Budget are not playing fair with the taxpayers of America?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. They are certainly not playing fair with them. The only thing for them to do is to come to up-State New York and try to revive and sustain some of the dairy farms that are going to wrack and ruin as a result of this disastrous policy.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. We in the subcommittee shaded down this approximately 3,200 additional personnel to approximately 1,600. Is the gentleman not in agreement with me that perhaps by a few amendments today we, the friends of agriculture, should try to show that while we want economy in government, we at the same time are willing to put the knife to our own Department in which we are most interested?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman is right. I agree with him.

I want to say one thing further in regard to subsidies. I have supported subsidies right down the line ever since that

question was started. Nobody can charge me with trying to sabotage the subsidy program which the administration has brought forth for the relief of the farmers. However, it is time that we are given a program that would supersede the subsidy plan so that we can go along and give the farmer some kind of a chance; give him an opportunity to live on something besides subsidies. I want to see that question considered, and I hope this House will solve it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be utilized by the committee if it desires to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this is an attempt by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] to cut \$300,000 from an item that has been reported at \$1,923,457 by the committee. It is the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. They have some rather peculiar ideas, as appears from the testimony on page 251 of the hearings. Let me read a couple of lines:

Mr. DIRKSEN. So if we reach that point in 1947, or beyond, where we have a surplus to deal with, then where we have exhausted every possibility that we can see at the moment to relieve the situation, and prices still continue to tumble, then next it would be your suggestion to let the level of prices on the domestic market go down to what may be the same thing as world markets.

Mr. TOLLEY. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And then subsidize the producer of agricultural products out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. TOLLEY. Yes.

And this comes at a time when the people of America have the money in their pockets to pay for their food; at a time when they and the thinking representatives of agriculture are against subsidies, and when they feel that we must get away from that sort of operation.

This is the same bureau which has been sending circulars of the most ridiculous character to farmers all over this land, with reference to the manner in which the farmers have acquired title; with reference to the manner in which they are operating their farms, and things that could be of absolutely no use from an economic standpoint. The real work that they are expected to do is provided for in the appropriation for crop and livestock estimates, which were referred to by the gentleman from Minnesota. There they are given \$2,037,000, and that is the only activity they have which is of value to the farmer. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] advises me that he did not intend to try to cut that item.

Is it not about time we tried to curtail those unnecessary and improper activities of the Department of Agriculture and put the Department on a more sound basis than it has fallen into the last few years?

I hope this amendment will be adopted and that we can save \$300,000 to the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment although I find myself practically in accord with the sponsor of the amendment as far as my feelings are concerned with reference to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. The only difference between us is that in my opinion the committee has gone as far as it can afford to go, looking to the work of the Department in its present reduction.

Mr. ABERNETHY. My colleague from Mississippi was one of those who got his hands on a report from this Bureau and it caused me to make some investigation in connection with which we found that this Bureau had gone very, very far afield in some of its activities. They had made some studies in Minnesota, Illinois, and in Mississippi, some of which they certainly had no right to make and the reports filed were such as to antagonize and stir up those of us coming from those areas. It was in my opinion a waste of Government money, but as I recall it the expenditures in this particular investigation and report was less than \$100,000.

We also took exception to and found fault with the attitude of the head of this Bureau in advocating that the American production of agricultural commodities be sold at the world price and that the Government through payments to the farmers make up the difference. I am glad to state the Secretary of Agriculture had entirely a different view of the matter.

When these things happen they have a natural tendency to make us want to cut to the bone. We have got to resist that attitude, however, because this work with which we find fault and in which I agree with the gentleman from Minnesota, is only a very small part of the activities of this Bureau.

We have cut this Bureau under this bill right at \$500,000. This is the Bureau that prepares the statistics that are used in so many of the workings of this Government, the Bureau that prepares the information and facts for parity loans of the CCC.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. As I said to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman realizes, of course, that this does not cut in any way the money available for statistics. In this we all agree.

Mr. WHITTEN. I beg to differ with the gentleman to some extent and I will point that out as I go along.

This Bureau is the one that prepares the statistics, and in addition to that they are engaged in making a study of the actual cost to the farmers of the things they have to buy. The information they accumulate is used throughout the Government; and while I agree with my friend from Minnesota, and was one of those who was primarily responsible, I might say, for going into some of these matters that this Bureau has veered off into, I do think that when you cut this appropriation more than 25 percent, cut them approximately \$500,000, which is 4 or 5 times as much as the amount spent for these particular activities; I think this Committee would be going astray to recommend to the House that

they make the additional cut. I feel that when we have cut \$500,000 from this Bureau we have gone as far as we can at this time, as certainly we must be sure that because of our difference with the Bureau we do not cut out work essential to the proper operation of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

The question was taken, and, the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided; and there were—ayes 46, noes 54.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. TARVER and Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 53, noes 68.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SPECIAL RESEARCH FUND, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

For enabling the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide for research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to provide for the further development of co-operative agricultural extension work and the more complete endowment and support of land-grant colleges," approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427, 427b, 427c, 427f); for administration of the provisions of section 5 of the said act, and for special research work, including the planning, programing, coordination, and printing the results of such research, to be conducted by such agencies of the Department as the Secretary may designate or establish, and to which he may make allotments from this fund, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; \$1,193,000, of which amount \$723,126 shall be available for the maintenance and operation of research laboratories and facilities in the major agricultural regions provided for by section 4 of said act.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted during the course of general debate to make the remarks I am going to make now because it follows along the line of some of the discussion that was had about the organization of the Department of Agriculture. For some time now I have had introduced in Congress a bill, H. R. 2215, the provisions of which I should like to call to the committee's attention and which are rather pertinent to the paragraph in the bill just read.

The purpose of that bill, frankly, is to simplify the agricultural program and the work of the Federal Department at the local level, and to bring together into the hands of a democratically elected committee of farmers in each county the local direction of all of those programs, and a coordination of them by that democratically elected committee of farmers. The actual choice of members of these committees begins in what are termed "agricultural communities," and the bill provides that the natural boundaries of those communities or neighborhoods shall be carefully drawn and marked out, and within each of those

communities the farmers and their wives, including the farm owners, tenants, and share croppers, shall elect three members to be on their committee. Those community members in turn will choose county committees, and in the hands of those county committees will be the local direction of all phases of the agricultural program, that is, the farm-credit program, the soil-conservation program, the various types of forestry programs, and everything else would be coordinated together at the local level by this means.

I believe this to be a constructive and important approach to this problem. The present Secretary of Agriculture has made some, I believe, very earnest and worth-while attempts at simplification of the structure of the Department. I am of the opinion that that work is going to go forward, that it needs to go forward, but that Congress will have to help. But I want to emphasize the fact that, from the viewpoint of the individual farmer, the place he needs to have the agricultural program simplified is in his local county much more than he needs to have it simplified in Washington at the top, and to the extent that it is possible to bring together, both physically and from the standpoint of administration, all the different parts of our agricultural program in that local community, we will have done a very great deal to be of constructive assistance to the farmers of America and also probably to make some substantial savings on governmental expense.

The Clerk read as follows:

Animal husbandry: For investigations and experiments in animal husbandry and animal and poultry feeding and breeding, and for carrying out the purposes of section 101 (b) of the organic act of 1944 (7 U. S. C. 429) authorizing cooperation with State authorities in the administration of regulations for the improvement of poultry, poultry products, and hatcheries, \$928,400.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RIZLEY: On page 20, line 3, strike out "\$928,400" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,300,400, \$75,000 of said total sum appropriated to be used to establish a poultry research station at Woodward, Okla."

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment speaks for itself. It increases the total appropriation \$75,000, to establish a poultry unit at Woodward, Okla.

In 1914 there was established at Woodward, Okla., the Southern Great Plains field station of the United States Bureau of Plant Industry, which has served a most useful purpose, not only for that section of Oklahoma but for the States of Colorado, Texas, New Mexico, and all of that great semi-arid section of the country. It has performed such excellent service that in 1921 a dairy field station was established at Woodward to serve that great section of the United States.

The only other poultry experiment stations that I know anything about in the country are located—one at Glendale, Ariz.; one at Beltsville, Md.; one at East Lansing, Mich.; and one at Brooksville,

Fla. There is no similarity, of course, in the conditions that exist in the sections of the country where these stations are established and the Great Plains area.

The purpose in going out to Woodward, Okla., and the purpose the Federal Government had back in 1914 and again in 1921, when these stations were established there, is to set up this experiment in that section of the country so it will serve the States of Colorado, Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico, and the whole high-plains semiarid regions where similar conditions exist. The poultry industry has become one of the vital industries in that particular section of the country in the past few years. There was a time when that whole section of the country was devoted to the raising of wheat and livestock. Then dairying came along and this experiment station for the dairy people was put in at Woodward. It is still a great wheat country and a great dairying country, but the poultry industry has great potential possibilities throughout this whole section. We need to stress it more. I believe this small expenditure of \$75,000 for the people in this great semiarid region will be well worth while at this time.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. I may have misunderstood the gentleman's amendment, but if I understood it correctly it provides for an additional expenditure of \$372,000.

Mr. RIZLEY. No; I just increase the appropriation of \$928,400 by \$75,000. May I say further to my distinguished friend from Georgia, I do not think it would require an annual appropriation of that amount once the unit is established.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Which is the nearest poultry experiment station to your district?

Mr. RIZLEY. Glendale, Ariz. Of course, some little experiments are carried on in local agricultural colleges.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I understand; but there are no experiment stations nearer than that?

Mr. RIZLEY. No; none nearer than Glendale, Ariz.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. That is the nearest one to your section of the country?

Mr. RIZLEY. That is right. The gentleman will recall that there is one at Beltsville, Md.; one at Lansing, Mich.; one in Florida; and one in Glendale, Ariz. Those are the only ones I know of.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. And your reason for wanting this experiment station is owing to the peculiar conditions obtaining in that section of the country, you require some special privilege?

Mr. RIZLEY. That is exactly right. And it is in keeping with what the Government found to be a good policy in establishing these other experiment stations at Woodward in the high-plains area.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma is always interesting and un-

doubtedly he has some information on this particular subject which would be of value to the Department and to the committee in writing an agricultural appropriation bill undertaking to take care of the needs of this type for the country as a whole. But the gentleman did not appear before our committee and urge this project. So far as his remarks indicate, he has not taken the matter up with the Department of Agriculture with a view to having Budget estimates submitted through the regular channels and accorded consideration first by the Bureau of the Budget and thereafter by the Congress. Of course, I do not anticipate that the gentleman feels under such circumstances the Committee of the Whole would be justified in increasing this item of appropriation by \$75,000 in order to take care of a station in his congressional district. There are undoubtedly many sections of the country which would like to have and might be able to justify expenditures of this type for a station of this character, but if and when they are justified the regular procedure should be followed, which would certainly involve some investigation by the Department and by the committee undertaking to write an appropriation bill before affirmative action is taken by the Committee of the Whole in writing such an appropriation into the bill. Therefore, I regretfully oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman and suggest to him that he present the matter to the Senate committee after the bill reaches the Senate in order that there may be full and thorough investigation of the facts in the case. I think he can rest assured that committee will give him sympathetic consideration. At the present time, on the basis of the facts as we have them, the amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Field crops: For investigations on the production, improvement, and diseases of alfalfa, barley, clover, corn, cotton, flax, grasses, oats, rice, rubber crops, sorghums, soybeans, sugar beets, sugarcane, tobacco, wheat, and other field crops, \$2,364,500; and there shall be transferred to the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering, without compensation therefor, real property (located in the vicinity of Salinas, Calif.) and personal property valued at not exceeding a total of \$306,000, acquired for and heretofore used in connection with the emergency rubber project; and there shall be included in the next annual Budget a statement in detail of the amount and value of the property so transferred.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRANGER: On page 25, line 3, after the word "crops", strike out "\$2,364,500" and insert "\$2,391,300."

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I feel called upon to offer this amendment. I think the subcommittee should accept the amendment. I think it is right and proper that the Committee on Agriculture be defended in this matter.

The amendment I have offered simply restores to the bill an item of \$26,800, an item that was recommended by the Department for the study of black root in sugar beets in the Ohio Valley. A complaint was made to the Committee on Agriculture that this disease was prevalent in Ohio, Michigan, and other States, and if it were not curbed the entire industry might be destroyed. Thereupon, the Committee on Agriculture appointed a subcommittee, of which I was chairman, to investigate this matter. We spent 2 days conducting hearings. We heard experts from the Department of Agriculture, farmers from the infested area, processors, and other people on this item. We thought it of enough importance to report it back to the entire Committee on Agriculture, which committee, by resolution, authorized us to take the matter up with the Department of Agriculture and insist that an appropriation be made for this purpose. At that time the Deficiency Appropriation Committee was conducting hearings. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], suggested that since we did not have an estimate from the Budget at that time, we wait until the regular appropriation, and then they would be glad to hear about this request for an appropriation. The Department recommended it, the Bureau of the Budget approved it. When it came to the subcommittee, for some reason it was disallowed. The Committee on Agriculture is behind this appropriation. It is absolutely necessary, and it seems to me that in good conscience the committee should accept the amendment, and I hope it will.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I would like to state that the information the gentleman has given to the Committee is correct. I think it would be in the interest of the sugar-beet industry throughout the entire United States for this small appropriation to be made, to prevent the spread of this disease.

Mr. GRANGER. I thank the gentleman. It will be proposed that there are funds in the appropriation available that could be diverted for this purpose. I do not think there is any money there. This work will not be done if this appropriation is not made. I am not going to propose an amendment that would earmark any of these funds now in the bill to go to this purpose, when they might be allocated to projects just as important as this particular project.

I hope the Committee will accept this amendment. I think it should in fairness to our committee and the investigation it made.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. TARVER for the amendment offered by Mr. GRANGER: Page 25, line 3, after the word "crops", insert "Including investigations in the black-root disease of sugar beets."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, we had some discussion of this subject matter

yesterday in the presentation of the bill, but since some of you were not able to be present I feel justified in referring to that discussion briefly at this time.

The budget estimate for the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering contemplated an increase of \$1,379,180 all for projects which were apparently well worth while. The committee, however, felt that under the financial conditions of the Government as they exist at this time, we must exercise some economy in dealing with requests, however worthy in character; and we felt further that it was quite possible for the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering to divert personnel from investigations which in many cases they had been carrying on for a great many years, sometimes without any fruitful result, and study these new problems that arise, and that there should not be an additional appropriation by Congress every time a new disease of an important agricultural plant, or a new disease of animals, or a new insect pest affecting plants or animals may be discovered. So we approved for the entire Bureau an increase above the appropriation for the present fiscal year of \$758,189, which is a very considerable increase in times like these; and we disallowed of the entire estimate submitted \$621,000 which included the item in which the gentleman from Utah is interested.

I have offered a substitute for his amendment providing that out of this rather tremendous amount of money which is here provided, \$2,364,600, they shall conduct investigations of the black root disease in sugar beets. I think there is no necessity for increasing the amount. I think the gentleman's cause is worthy, that this disease is of a character which ought to receive investigation; but I believe the Bureau will be able to conduct the investigation within the limits of the funds which have been provided and without hampering any useful activity which it is carrying on; that there is, therefore, no necessity for the appropriation of additional money for that purpose.

I therefore hope the Committee will approve the substitute amendment which I have offered.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am in full agreement with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] that we can very nicely take care of this item out of the \$2,364,000 already allotted, and I hope that will satisfy the gentleman from Utah. This is specific notice to the Department that they must take care of the gentleman's item out of this particular sum. I sincerely hope that the substitute will be agreed to.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I may say it is not the gentleman's problem alone. This is a problem that affects the whole country. What you are saying here is simply that we take money that has already

been allocated to other projects, perhaps just as important as this one, and earmark the money.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. No. I do not mean that at all. There are—and the gentleman from Georgia will bear me out—in this particular item of more than \$2,000,000, items from which the bureau can very easily squeeze out some of the water and take care of the project of the gentleman from Utah.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. CLEVINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah is identical with one I offered a moment ago. The gentleman from Georgia refers to this black root disease as being a sugar disease of rather new origin. That is not so. It has been prevalent up and down the Mississippi and Ohio River Valleys, and as far west as the Rocky Mountain States, for years. It is progressively getting worse. I have had the brush-off year after year on this thing by the statement that it would be taken care of out of this fund.

I have been in communication with the Department this afternoon, and they assure me that there is no money available to make this study, that this appropriation is very necessary.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVINGER. Let me speak a moment. The gentleman foreclosed a lot of debate on this thing yesterday. I have not taken any time of the Committee. When I ask for an expenditure it is an event in this House if you are acquainted with my voting record.

The shortage of sugar today is not a joke to the people of this country. These black root experiments were started in my own district years ago. When the Wallace influence came into the Department of Agriculture, he was very bitter against the production of sugar in continental United States, either cane or beet. That attitude began years ago and since then they have taken \$100,000 away from the study of beet and cane sugar diseases.

This appropriation is one of the most essential things that has ever come before the House. There is not a man in this House who thinks I would stand up here and ask for an appropriation if it was not a proper one. It is an appropriation that will return a thousandfold.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman is aware, I am sure, that if the substitute amendment offered by myself is adopted, despite anything the Department may have said to the gentleman it will be compelled to study the black root disease of sugar beets. There will be no way for the Department to evade it. So the gentleman will get what he wants if the substitute is adopted and the Treasury will be saved \$28,600.

Mr. CLEVINGER. Will the gentleman give me that assurance?

Mr. TARVER. I am giving it to the gentleman now.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I want to say that is not any assurance.

Mr. CLEVINGER. I know it is no assurance.

Mr. GRANGER. It is just a matter that money has already been allocated to other experiments and you will not get any money for this. There is not any money there for it.

Mr. CLEVINGER. I have been here and I have appeared before the Agriculture Committee in the other body to try to get the item taken care of year after year and nothing has been done.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. GILLIE. May I say that I trust what the gentleman from Georgia said is true, because in my district Adams County is one of the heaviest producing counties in the district. The sugar-beet growers had to abandon the production of sugar beets because of leaf rot.

Mr. CLEVINGER. Yes. There is another angle to this.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVINGER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I am wondering if this thing could not be worked out by inserting in the substitute offered by the gentleman from Georgia the words, "including not to exceed \$26,800 for the investigation of black-root disease."

Mr. CLEVINGER. That is perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. TABER. That would not increase the over-all amount.

Mr. CLEVINGER. Not at all.

Mr. TABER. I am wondering if the gentleman from Georgia would agree to that?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. I feel that we ought not to designate the exact amount to be used. I feel that we should leave to the discretion of the Bureau of Plant Industry the determination of how much money should be used for the purpose of studying one disease of sugar beets and how much for another. There are \$214,000 in the bill for sugar beets alone. So I believe the orderly way would be simply to include the language which has been suggested in my substitute amendment, relying upon the officials of the Bureau to provide the necessary funds which, in their judgment, should be used for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. CLEVINGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVINGER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. If that were done, they would have to spend that amount on this program. As I understand the situation described by the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Utah, this is a real serious situation.

Mr. CLEVINGER. It certainly is.

Mr. TABER. I ask the gentleman from Georgia if he will not accept that amendment. It might help solve the problem.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I believe the other method of procedure, as I have indicated, would be the better method, but in the interest of harmony, and being sure that it affects what is apparently a very grave problem, I ask unanimous consent that the language of my substitute may be amended so that the substitute will read: "including \$26,800 for the investigation of black-root disease of sugar beets."

Mr. CLEVINGER. That is acceptable to me, I will say to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Georgia for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah as amended by the substitute.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insect and plant disease control: For carrying out operations or measures to eradicate, suppress, control, or to prevent or retard the spread of Japanese beetle, sweet-potato weevil, Mexican fruitflies, gypsy and brown-tail moths, Dutch elm disease, phony peach and peach mosaic, cereal rusts, and pink bollworm and *Thurberia weevil*, including the enforcement of quarantine regulations and cooperation with States to enforce plant quarantines as authorized by the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151-167), and including the establishment of such cotton-free areas as may be necessary to stamp out any infestation of the pink bollworm as authorized by the act of February 8, 1930 (46 Stat. 67) and for the enforcement of domestic plant quarantines through inspection in transit, including the interception and disposition of materials found to have been transported interstate in violation of Federal plant quarantine laws or regulations, and operations under the Terminal Inspection Act (7 U. S. C. 166), \$2,791,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees, farm animals, farm crops, or other property injured or destroyed: *Provided further*, That, in the discretion of the Secretary, no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the control of sweetpotato weevil in any State until such State has provided cooperation necessary to accomplish this purpose, or for barberry eradication until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by States, counties, or local authorities, or by individuals or organizations for the accomplishment of this purpose: *Provided further*, That in the discretion of the Secretary, no expenditures

from this appropriation shall be made for applying methods of control of the Dutch elm disease in any State where measures for the removal and destruction of trees on non-Federal lands suffering from the Dutch elm disease are not in force, provided such removal and destruction are deemed essential or appropriate for the carrying on of the control program, nor until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by State, county, or local authorities, or by individuals, or organizations concerned: *Provided, however*, That expenditures incurred for removal of trees infected with Dutch elm disease from non-Federal lands shall not be considered a part of such appropriations, subscriptions, or contributions: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the removal and destruction of trees infected with the Dutch elm disease except where such trees are located on property owned or controlled by the Government of the United States, or on property included within local experimental control areas.

RELATIVE TO THE REESTABLISHMENT OF THE TOBACCO INSECT LABORATORY AT QUINCY, FLA., AND TO DOG-FLY ERADICATION AND CONTROL MEASURES

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak on two items which I feel should be carried in the present bill. First: Insects constitute one of the serious hazards involved in the production of cigar tobacco in the Georgia-Florida area. Growers in north Florida applied to the United States Department of Agriculture as early as 1915 for assistance in controlling these pests. A permanent research laboratory was established at Quincy, Fla., in 1917 and has been in continuous operation until 1943.

The work of the laboratory has been of vital assistance to the tobacco industry and to the counties at large. Specific controls of high efficiency have been developed for the tobacco budworm and flea beetle. Valuable, but less effective methods have been found for controlling other pests. No satisfactory remedy has been found for hornworms which continue to reduce the value of the crop.

During the past 25 years the laboratory built up a library of information of vital importance to our tobacco industry. The station staff maintained a constant watch for insect outbreaks and the introduction of foreign pests. All of these services were performed at an infinitesimal cost as compared to the taxes paid by our industry.

The Quincy laboratory and five other similar stations located in Connecticut, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia were financed from an appropriation fund which was a separate item under "Truck crop and garden insect investigations, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine," in the yearly appropriation bill of the Department of Agriculture.

In 1942 a reduction in appropriations resulted in reduced facilities for the Quincy laboratory and the discontinuance of the Connecticut laboratory. In 1943 the appropriation was further reduced and the department was forced to make additional curtailments. Efforts made at the time were not successful in preventing the discontinuance of the Quincy laboratory. At the present time

the equipment and library of the laboratory remain intact and the remaining personnel have been temporarily assigned to other departmental work.

While we favor economy in all governmental operations, I wish to emphasize the fact that the curtailment of necessary functions is not real economy. I consider the work of the Quincy laboratory of vital importance to our industry and that the relatively small expenditure needed in its operation is fully justified.

I take this opportunity to bring these facts to the attention of other Representatives in Congress with the request that they help to reestablish the tobacco insect research work at Quincy. Delay in this matter will be distinctly unfavorable for the progress of our industry. I am certain that the Department is in favor of continuing this laboratory. The necessary adjustment in funds should be made in the present appropriation bill with the stipulation to the Department that the laboratory be reestablished. Representatives of the other States where tobacco insect laboratories are now located will no doubt concur in this effort as these laboratories have suffered definite deductions due to the lack of sufficient appropriations.

I respectfully request that we consider the necessary financing of the Quincy laboratory as an immediate and pressing obligation. It is estimated that \$15,000 to \$20,000 per year will be ample to finance the laboratory.

THE DOG FLY

The second item is "Dog-fly control and eradication." For years we in northwest Florida have fought the dog fly, which is one of the worst pests in our area from the standpoint of humans and of livestock. At one time this pest constituted a threat to our tourist trade and to the dairy and livestock industries. Control measures have been in effect for several years, in combination with detailed studies on the life and habits of the dog fly. As a result real progress has been made in destroying these pests and they are not now the serious nuisance which they constituted a few years ago.

However, it is obvious that control measures must be continued, otherwise we shall lose the progress made. If continued it is my belief we shall in a reasonable time eradicate the dog fly. The Army has for the war period helped to keep this important work in progress because of the handicap provided by the dog fly to the training programs.

We in northwest Florida cannot afford to have this work discontinued. For the money to be expended, I know of nothing which will be of greater value to us. It has a key importance in the continued growth and progress of two cornerstones of our development—for tourists and the livestock industry.

The Clerk read as follows:

Forest and range management investigations: Fire, silvicultural, watershed, and other forest investigations and experiments under said section 2, as amended, and investigations and experiments to develop improved methods of management of forest and other ranges

under section 7, at forest or range experimental stations or elsewhere, \$2,330,000.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: On page 38, line 19, strike out "\$2,330,000" and insert "\$2,405,000."

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the \$75,000 increase in this appropriation is the erection of an experimental forest in the Delaware Valley. For a great many years we have had a very acute problem of water supply. The establishment of this experimental forest will make it possible to study the effect of the forest on water supply, on the rapidity of the run-off, on floods, and low-water flow.

Annually, we appropriate many hundreds of thousands of dollars for the purpose of dredging the channels in the lower region of the river so as to make possible the sailing of our battleships into the Philadelphia Navy Yard. Annually, the States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey spend upward of a quarter of a million dollars for the repair of the interstate bridges along the river.

As most of you know, the water supply in Philadelphia is inadequate. Under an arrangement made between the States of New Jersey and New York many millions of gallons of water are drawn off the upper reaches of the river, and from this supply most of the metropolitan area in New Jersey receives its water. However, annually the problem is becoming more acute.

The Committee on Appropriations added \$400,000 to the budget estimate. It certainly seems to me that if they have gone over the budget recommendation by that much we can well afford the additional \$75,000. Both the States of New Jersey and Pennsylvania are spending a great deal of money in making these studies. In the Delaware Valley, organizations have been set up composed of leading citizens who are, out of their own pockets, employing engineers and other people to do this work. I am quite certain that after the work that has already been started by the States and these local organizations is completed we shall not need the appropriations that are now being made for flood damages, the dredging of the river and, more important, an adequate water supply for a section in which a quarter of the population of the United States resides.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, last year when this question of experimental forest and range stations came up, the committee indicated its opinion that any program of this type, however desirable, and we thought that it is desirable, should be a Nation-wide program worked out by the Forest Service in cooperation with the State forestry officials and intended to meet the problem of the Nation as a whole. We recognize the fact that different types of forestry problems exist in different areas of the country and have felt there should be a decentralization of forest investigations. Congress last year provided funds with which 12 additional

forest and range investigation stations have been established or will be established during the current fiscal year. Our committee had requested the Forest Service to work out this Nation-wide plan of dealing with this very great problem. In their evidence before us, in the present session of the Congress, you will observe from a reading of the hearings, they have submitted to us a plan, the initial part of which contemplates the establishment of 16 additional forest and range experimental stations throughout the Nation at various points which you will find designated in the hearings. We provide in this bill \$480,000 above the budget or \$30,000 each for each of these additional suggested stations, bringing the total number of stations for the next fiscal year to 53, to provide for their establishment. If you will examine the hearings on pages 852 and 853, you will find that of the present experimental forest stations already established, there is one located at Kane, Pa., in the State of the gentleman who has offered this amendment. You will find that among the additional forest experiment stations which are proposed for establishment under the language of the pending bill, one is proposed for Anthracite, Pa., also in the State of the gentleman who has offered this amendment. I feel under these circumstances with many areas of the country desiring the establishment of stations of this type, the gentleman from Pennsylvania should be satisfied to have 2 of these stations out of a total of 53 which will be provided for the entire country if the pending appropriation bill is approved. I certainly feel the Committee of the Whole should not provide \$75,000 to establish an additional station for the gentleman from Pennsylvania under these circumstances. This must be a Nation-wide plan worked out by people who are qualified to do so, which people in my judgment are the officials of the Forest Service in cooperation with the State forestry authorities.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. If the stations in the State of Pennsylvania which you have just mentioned were anywhere near the place where the forestry services, both Federal and State, think there should be one, I would not be offering this amendment. The stations that have been provided for are nowhere near this very important section.

Mr. TARVER. Does the gentleman feel he is entitled to more than 2 stations out of the 53 for the entire United States?

Mr. WALTER. I am not going into that question, but I might point out the fact that my State makes a very large contribution toward the money that has provided all of these stations.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I feel the gentleman from Georgia has declared the situation exactly as it exists with reference to the subcommittee and I sincerely hope that we do not begin to take care of this great problem in a piecemeal fashion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Under special acts: For the acquisition of land to facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage originating within the exterior boundaries of the following national forests, in accordance with the provisions of the following acts authorizing annual appropriations of forest receipts for such purposes, and in not to exceed the following amounts from such receipts: Uinta and Wasatch National Forests, Utah, act of August 26, 1935 (Public Law 337), as amended, \$40,000; Cache National Forest, Utah, act of May 11, 1938 (Public Law 505), as amended, \$10,000; San Bernardino and Cleveland National Forests, Riverside County, Calif., act of June 15, 1938 (Public Law 634), as amended, \$22,000; Nevada and Toiyabe National Forests, Nevada, act of June 25, 1938 (Public Law 748), as amended, \$10,000; Angeles National Forest, Calif., act of June 11, 1940 (Public Law 591), \$20,000; Cleveland National Forest, San Diego county, Calif., act of June 11, 1940 (Public Law 589), \$5,000; Sequoia National Forest, Calif., act of June 17, 1940 (Public Law 637), \$35,000; in all, \$142,000.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

If I may have the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee, I rise to make inquiry regarding the effect of the reduction in the appropriation for land acquisition, since reference was made in the report to the purchase of lands in the Ozark and Ouachita National Forests. As I understand it, it was not the purpose of the subcommittee to suspend the purchase of lands in that area, but merely to bring it under the Weeks Act, rather than under the special act of 1940. Is that correct?

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman is correct. It was the feeling of the committee that purchases of land in the Ozark and Ouachita National Forests, which are eligible for consideration in any general land-acquisition program under the Weeks Act, should be made under the general program and not under any special act providing for the diversion of receipts from these forests for that purpose. It is outlined in the report, and it is for that reason that we struck out the \$250,000 estimated for the purchase of land in those two national forests from forest receipts, placing those forests on the same basis as other forests located on watersheds throughout the United States.

Mr. HAYS. Nothing developed in the hearings that would affect at all the continued acquisition of lands in that area, as in other national forests?

Mr. TARVER. Under the general program.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman very much.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

For carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act approved November 9, 1921, as amended (23 U. S. C. 23, 23a), and for the construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of roads and trails on experimental areas under Forest Service administration, (1) \$12,500,000 for forest development roads and trails, which sum is authorized to be appropriated by the act of December 20, 1944 (Public Law 521), and (2) \$13,714,222 for forest highways, which latter

sum consists of (a) the balance of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1942 and the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1943 by the act of September 5, 1940 (54 Stat. 867, Public Law 780, 76th Cong.), and (b) \$4,500,000, a part of the amount authorized to be appropriated by the act of December 20, 1944 (Public Law 521), in all, \$26,214,222 (including not to exceed \$99,804 for personal services in the District of Columbia), to be immediately available and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the rental, purchase, construction, or alteration of buildings necessary for the storage and repair of equipment and supplies used for road and trail construction and maintenance, but the total cost of any such building purchased, altered, or constructed under this authorization shall not exceed \$10,000, with the exception that any building erected, purchased, or acquired, the cost of which was \$10,000 or more, may be improved within any fiscal year by an amount not to exceed 2 percent of the cost of such building as certified by the Secretary.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELLIOTT: On page 41, line 25, strike out "\$12,500,000" and insert "\$23,000,000."

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, the reason I have offered this amendment to increase the amount \$10,500,000 is due to the fact that we have been discussing for more than a week legislation to provide more homes. We know that in order to get more homes we must have more roads opened up in the various areas to provide lumber to build these homes. The Forestry Department have advised me that they need an additional \$10,500,000. I talked to them as late as yesterday. Of the \$12,500,000 now in the bill, \$5,500,000 will go for the purpose of maintenance, leaving only \$7,000,000 for new construction. Any of us who knows anything about road construction knows that the \$7,000,000 will not go very far in opening up new roads and trails to get to areas where there is new lumber to be brought out.

We can talk all we want to about legislation. Without lumber we cannot and will not build the homes needed for the veterans, and I think this is very much needed. The Forest Service told me, as I said yesterday, that they need this additional amount of money; and I have sat on the Roads Committee for the last 7 or 8 years and heard the testimony of the Forest Service touching the need for more roads and trails, and now that we have come to the point of needing lumber and needing it badly I hope the committee will grant this additional money to make it possible for us to have additional roads and trails into the areas to provide the urgently needed material, as I have stated.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the committee is very strongly of the opinion that all needed funds for the development of forest roads and trails ought to be provided in order to facilitate the utilization of the national forest resources in the pending building program which is of such vital importance to the people of our country, and we have sought to ascertain how

much money could be utilized in that program, that is, in the construction and development of forest roads and trails; and we have placed in this bill every dollar of the money which was recommended by the departmental authorities, every dollar of the money which was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for this purpose, and all of the money which the most enthusiastic proponent of this type of construction advocated in his appearance before our subcommittee. So there is no reason why the Committee of the Whole should add an additional \$10,000,000 or some approximate amount to the \$12,500,000 we have provided in the bill and which in itself is an increase of \$5,699,067 over the funds available for the present fiscal year. We have certainly dealt in a very liberal manner with this particular item, and if the Members have the opportunity to examine the hearings and the evidence of the authorities not only of the Forest Service but of the Bureau of Public Roads they will find that we have provided all of the money that, as I have said, even the most enthusiastic supporters of the program suggested for utilization during the next fiscal year.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I might say to my friend from Georgia that the forest people of the State of California arrived here this week Tuesday, came to my office and asked that this amount of money be increased by at least \$10,000,000 to provide badly needed funds to open up new roads and trails. I immediately contacted the Forest Service and again yesterday talked to them and asked them if the amount of money they had was enough since the people from the West had come here demanding more funds, and they estimated there should be at least \$10,500,000 more provided.

Mr. TARVER. When the gentleman says "They told him so and so" the question naturally arises as to who "they" may have been. When I speak of officials of the Forest Service I speak of those who appeared before our subcommittee and undertook to represent the Forest Service and who knew about this particular question. There is nothing in their testimony to justify the addition of a single dollar to the amount carried in the pending bill.

The authorities from the State of California who called at the gentleman's office 2 or 3 days ago with respect to this matter, if they are justified in their position, which I do not think they are, were certainly somewhat negligent in not undertaking to contact the gentleman himself earlier or our subcommittee, for our subcommittee has been conducting hearings on this bill ever since the 14th day of January. We have never denied a hearing to anybody who wanted to be heard and it is certainly a rather late day for these authorities from California to come to the gentleman on Tuesday of this week and suggest that he have the House without justification appearing in the hearings and upon their solicitation approve \$10,000,000 for an item of this kind. I

sincerely hope that the amendment of the gentleman will be rejected.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Since January, or even February, the housing situation has changed materially, and I am appealing for these funds because the condition shows that if we get this lumber we will have to open up new areas in order to get it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to back up what the gentleman from Georgia has stated upon this particular amendment offered by the gentleman from California. We have been very liberal in regard to the Forestry Service and all of its branches and I see no reason for the fear as expressed by the gentleman from California that there will not be ample sums to take care of the situation as he presents it.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to take much of the time of the committee in what I have to say on the pending amendment. It has come to my attention only recently, even since the debate began on the housing bill, that a serious bottleneck in connection with the production of lumber in the Pacific Northwest area, which produces some 8,000,000,000 feet, nearly 40 percent of the Nation's total, is the shortage of logs. That is one of the reasons why, in that region, lumber production is down about 30 percent over what it was a year ago. The shortage of logs, I am informed, is partly due to the inaccessibility of the Federally-owned timber which could be made accessible by additional forest roads and trails, or access roads.

I understand from talking with members of the Appropriations Committee that they are very anxious to have the access-road program at the maximum and that the sum included in the bill was placed where it is with the idea that that is about all of the money that could be expended during a year. It develops now, with the pressure that is being put on the Northwest area and all over the Nation for more lumber, that additional access-road money could be used to good advantage to aid the housing program. Furthermore, we know that this money is not an outright expenditure to the Government. The price of the timber sold by the Government is increased sufficiently to amortize the expense for these

access roads, so this amendment does not mean an additional spending program but the appropriation is self-liquidating over a period of time.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I agree with the gentleman that our much-needed building program depends on these access roads into untouched timber-areas. I wonder if the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] or the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] can give us any guaranty that we will have adequate appropriation for such access roads in the other bill? I hope we may count on their help toward such appropriation.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I cannot answer that question. It has been suggested that this matter could be taken up in a deficiency appropriation bill. This is March, and the road-building program should go forward now. If additional funds are appropriated for access roads, which will help the housing program, they should be appropriated in this bill. I know that the program for additional access roads has been approved by the Housing Administrator, who will probably be the Expediter under the new bill.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. May I ask the gentleman if it is not true, particularly in the Northwest area, that the major portion of this timber is owned by the Federal Government?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. About 60 percent of it, I may say.

Mr. ANGELL. This money which is allowed for forest roads and trails is really going to the Government itself to market a product which it has.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. The Government is repaid by the firm which buys the timber on an amortization basis over a period of time, so an access road appropriation is not an outright expenditure of Government funds.

I strongly urge the adoption of this amendment as necessary due to the present emergency need of logs for lumber for housing.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ELLIOTT and Mr. ELLSWORTH) there were—ayes 15, noes, 36.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Soil-conservation operations: For carrying out preventive measures to conserve soil and water, including such special measures as may be necessary to prevent floods and the siltation of reservoirs, and including the improvement of farm irrigation and land drainage, the establishment and operation of conservation nurseries, the making of conservation plans and surveys, and the dissemination of information, \$37,800,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation may be expended for soil and water conservation operations in demonstration projects.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted that the Committee on Appropriations has seen fit to increase the appropriation for soil conservation. I note from the report that the number of soil-conservation districts has steadily increased until now we have over 1,463 and it is expected that by the end of the year we will have 1,580 districts organized. We are told that by the end of the 1947 fiscal year we will probably have 1,761 districts. This illustrates very forcefully the tremendous interest in this great program. It is Nation-wide. There is great interest in the hill sections and also in the sections of level land.

Our lands have been washing away for 150 years and the destruction has proceeded at a rapid rate during the war because we had little labor and inadequate machinery to conserve our soils. Now that the war is over it is a matter of first importance that we redouble our efforts in the great program to conserve and rehabilitate our soils so that this Nation may not be left helpless in years to come. Not only is this service needed in the hill sections, but it is needed in the valleys and level sections for drainage purposes. In Louisiana we have tens and tens of thousands of acres of the finest land in the world that is not productive because of surface water. Through this program these vast areas are being drained and placed in cultivation.

Mr. Chairman, this is a great national program, just as flood control is a national problem. We are making this year the farm-forest program a national program. This is as it ought to be. It is a matter of great interest to the people living in every section of the Nation, the city dweller as well as those living in the country, that we conserve our lands and our resources for our children and those who will be living here in the coming centuries. Any other view is shortsighted. I, therefore, commend the committee for not reducing this fund, but, on the other hand, increasing it. That is wise. That is farsighted. That is looking after those who are to come after us. That is a very wise expenditure of public funds. I hope this full sum remains in the bill. I shall oppose any effort to reduce it. It is none too large. I appeal for universal support for the Soil Conservation Service. It represents a very wise investment.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

For all expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g-590q), and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281-1407) (except the provisions of sections 201, 202, 303, 381, and 383 and the provisions of titles IV and V), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not to exceed \$6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States; purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals; \$257,500,000, together with \$42,500,000 of the unobligated balances for the fiscal years 1944, 1945, and 1946 of the funds appropriated by section

32 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612 (c)); in all, \$300,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1947, for compliance with programs under said provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended, pursuant to the provisions of the 1946 programs carried out during the period July 1, 1945, to December 31, 1946, inclusive, and, in addition, \$12,500,000 for making additional payments on an acreage and pound basis for harvesting seeds of grasses and legumes determined by the Secretary to be necessary for an adequate supply of such seeds; in all, \$312,500,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$26,942,888 of the total sum provided under this head shall be available during the current fiscal year, for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such programs, the cost of aerial photographs, however, not to be charged to such limitation; but not more than \$7,886,480 shall be transferred to the appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for the functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive order (No. 9069) of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State or county information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information to individual farmers: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1947 programs (so long as such administrative expenses do not relate to programs exceeding \$300,000,000, including administration) of soil-building practices and soil and water-conservation practices, under the act of February 29, 1936, as amended, and programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; but the payments or grants under such program shall be conditioned upon the utilization of land with respect to which such payments or grants are to be made, in conformity with farming practices which will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as determined and approved by the State agricultural conservation committee for the respective States: *Provided further*, That the Secretary, may, in his discretion, from time to time transfer to the General Accounting Office such sums as may be necessary to pay administrative expenses of the General Accounting Office in auditing payments under this item: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary in the 1946, 1947, and 1948 programs under said act of February 29, 1936, as amended, provided, however, that the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to make payments to farmers who complied with the terms and conditions of the agricultural conservation programs, formulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, if the Secretary determines that, because of induction into the armed forces of the United States, such farmers failed to file, or were prevented from filing, applications for payment under any such program during the period the applicable appropriation for such program was available for obligation, such payments to be made out of the unobligated balance of the appropriation, "Conservation

and use of agricultural land resources," in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1946: *Provided further*, That an application for payment on the prescribed form is filed by any such farmer within 1 year from the date of his discharge from the armed forces, or by December 31, 1946, whichever is later: *Provided further*, That no part of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the act of July 11, 1919 (18 U. S. C. 201), to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 47, lines 12 to 17, strike out beginning with the word "together" in line 12 to and including the figure "\$300,000,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the Budget submitted an estimate of \$257,500,000 for this particular item. The committee has brought in a recommendation for an increase of \$42,500,000, taking the funds out of the tariff money which was set aside for agricultural uses by an act in 1935, under the so-called Borah amendment.

This is an item where we have a tremendous amount of money paid out to agricultural committeemen and a tremendous lot paid out to farmers. The total ran \$300,000,000 last year, and the Budget has recommended \$257,500,000 for that purpose this year. It would seem to me that it was about time we began to be ready to go along with Budget cuts of this kind, and not raise them on every occasion. Our farmers are receiving moderately good prices, especially for grain and corn, and reasonably good prices for livestock. They are at this time in a position where they should be receiving prices for their products based upon a fair return, and I believe they are. I do not believe we need at this time to provide all of these funds for allotments to them. This is not the item where there is an agency which goes out and provides assistance to farmers in working out their problems in soil conservation; it is an item where we have these agricultural committeemen and where we have the allotments to farmers.

I hope that this amendment will be adopted and that we can save \$42,500,000 to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have the very highest regard for the sincerity of purpose of the gentleman from New York and for his feeling that drastic economy should be effected in governmental expenditures. I have, as I think he will testify, cooperated with him in many items which

have had the attention of the Committee on Appropriations in trying to bring about needed and warranted economies. I do not feel that the action suggested by his amendment in relation to the conservation and use of land resources program, commonly known as the triple-A program, is warranted or that, if taken, it would be in compliance with what amounts to a moral obligation on the part of the Congress of the United States.

Last year in the consideration of the agricultural appropriations bill for the present fiscal year the Budget suggested that this program for the 1946 crop year should be reduced to \$200,000,000, and they submitted a recommendation for the inclusion of that language in the bill. Our subcommittee struck it out, and the question was submitted to the House and thereafter to the Senate. Finally, in the adoption of the conference report, an agreement was had upon limitation of this year's program to \$300,000,000. Plans were formulated by the administrative authorities upon the basis of recommendations submitted by State triple-A committees for the utilization of that amount of money. The farmers of the country have been led to believe that a program involving the expenditure of that amount of money would be carried out during the present crop year.

In my judgment there is a moral obligation on the Congress of the United States to make good the amount which it set in passing the Agriculture Appropriation Act for the present fiscal year as the limit for this program. That is the reason our committee, with the exception of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], felt that this amount of money which the Budget had undertaken to deduct from the funds available for the present crop year program should be restored.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. The question I had in mind was to what the \$42,500,000 was to be expended for. I believe the gentleman has partially answered the question.

Mr. TARVER. It is the sum necessary for bringing the amount involved up to \$300,000,000, the amount of limitation in the program provided in the agriculture appropriation act for the present fiscal year.

The Budget desires to gradually eliminate this program. That is a question for the Congress of the United States to decide as to whether it shall be eliminated or not. It is not a program so much for the benefit of the farmers of the United States as it is for the conservation of the soil of the United States and repair of erosions of the soil and the protection of a great natural resource which, as I said on yesterday, is not the property of those who presently appear to own it but the property of future generations of Americans. I believe the people of this country want this program carried on, not in order to add to the income of farmers, but in order to protect this great natural resource. If you do not want it done, if you want the program reduced, the time to make that decision is in the enactment of the bill for the next crop year. You can place a limitation of less than \$300,-

000,000 for the next crop year if you want to. There is language in the bill relating to that subject matter. Then no program above the figures designated by you will be formulated for the next crop year. But this program for which this appropriation is proposed is a program which you authorized last year. Upon the basis of your authorization, the departmental authorities have taken action; the AAA authorities in the various States in the Union have taken action; and presumably millions of farmers throughout the Nation who rely upon the limitation which you fixed in the bill for the present crop year have undertaken to meet the requirements for participation in this program, upon the basis of the figures which you named. I think it is not now a matter of good conscience to refuse to appropriate the money necessary to carry out the implied moral obligation. We hope, therefore, that the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot go along with my good friend from New York on this amendment. To me, Members of the House, this \$300,000,000 does not represent the same sort of money, even though it does come out of the Treasury, as the money which is spent for personnel and such.

It was upon my motion in the subcommittee that this AAA fund was restored. I called attention in our hearings to the fact that the Department, on the one hand, asked for 3,254 new personnel over 1946 and in the same breath the Budget tries to delete over \$40,000,000 of direct payments to 6,000,000 farmers for soil-conserving practices.

We in the subcommittee trimmed out a good part of the over \$50,000,000 requested to implement the new personnel and other ventures. It is my hope we can still further trim the sails of the good ship "bureaucracy" so as to make more efficient the great number of personnel who remain. We do have thousands of first-class men and women in our Department of Agriculture. There is, however, some driftwood that should be cut loose, but not at the expense of soil conservation. Unless we have a cooperative program among the farmers of America to keep up the fertility of our soil, we are likely to be in the same position that China is today, in the years to come.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. As one who represents a city district, who has always supported authorizations and appropriations for this purpose, the convincing thing that prompted me, looking at it from a national interest, was that this was a real investment for our country to make. The fertility of the soil is a matter of paramount interest to all of us, no matter what our economic lot may be or where we may live. Furthermore, I have always been impressed that we are very fortunate in America to have not only a powerful industrial nation but one of the greatest agricultural nations

of the world. That is very vital from the angle of national defense. That evidenced itself in no unmistakable manner during the last war.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to my friend from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that our soil conservation program is a great insurance policy in favor of future generations of this country. The people of the city, who must look to the farmers for food, are just as much interested in this program as the man who lives on a farm. The most economical investment this Nation has made is in money expended in conserving the soil which is to support the future generations of this country. I hope this amendment will be defeated.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] yesterday pointed out what has happened to other nations. We have started in the nick of time to conserve our soil, and I am surprised that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] would come in here and try to hinder a program which means so much.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. This item is for allotments to farmers and is not for soil conservation. The soil conservation is the \$37,000,000 item that we have passed over.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I say to the gentleman that I do not agree with that statement. I know the good job the gentleman has done in saving millions upon millions for the taxpayers of America. He is entitled to the thanks of our Government for his outstanding work in that line. This, however, is an investment in the future for the welfare of our children and grandchildren. Unless we do have a cooperative effort by which the farmers have an incentive to join and preserve for the future the soils of this Nation, I really fear that we will wake up some day and find for example that the great States of Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Illinois, that great Midwest which today produces two-fifths of the food of America, will not be what we always proudly proclaimed it to be, that is, the bread basket of the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. TARVER: On page 48, lines 21 to 23, strike out all the language within the parentheses and insert in lieu thereof the following: "amounting to \$300,000,000, including administration."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I am presenting for the consideration of the Committee of the Whole the question to which I made reference a few moments ago. That is, whether or not you are

going to authorize for the crop year 1947 program, \$300,000,000. I am presenting it in language which is so definite in character as to admit of no misconstruction. It is the time now to decide whether you want to reduce the 1947 crop-year program, not next year after the plans of the Department and those of State AAA authorities and the farmers have already been completed. If we want to reduce it, reduce it now and reject my amendment and offer some other amendment to indicate a lower figure.

But if you want to fix it definitely and in such form as to enable the farmers of the country to rely upon it implicitly so that even the Bureau of the Budget cannot disregard it, then adopt the amendment which I have offered.

I may say that I have submitted this amendment to the members of the subcommittee and it is, therefore, offered as a committee amendment, since it met with their approval.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. I wish to see if I thoroughly understand the amendment. The bill as now written puts on a ceiling of \$300,000,000 for next year.

Mr. TARVER. Exactly.

Mr. POAGE. As I understand it, if we adopt the gentleman's amendment we have in effect approved \$300,000,000 for next year without either putting it up or down; in other words, it is a kind of floor as well as ceiling.

Mr. TARVER. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 62, noes 19.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HESELTON: On page 49, line 1, after the word "amended", insert "which programs shall be established under a formula for the distribution of funds among the several states in accordance with the true conservation needs of said states."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, let me first express my appreciation to the Committee for not raising a point of order against this amendment, for it would clearly be subject to a point of order if one were made. I hope that what I may say in support of the amendment will lead the Committee to accept it as a constructive effort to place this soil-conservation program of the AAA on a sound basis. Yesterday during the general debate I outlined the reason for urging that the Committee adopt this amendment, and you will find that statement at pages 2031 and 2032 of yesterday's RECORD.

I wish also to refer to the hearings, pages 1692 to 1701 and also page 1953, which indicate that this is a definitely and completely nonpartisan effort on the part of the New England delegation in

Congress to create a formula for the distribution of the Federal soil-conservation funds which will reflect justly the true conservation needs of every State in the Nation. We first undertook to bring this about by a direct appeal to the Department, and I want to state frankly that we did so because we knew it could be demonstrated clearly that New England has not been receiving an equitable share of the funds devoted to this purpose. We were not successful in our efforts with the Department, and, consequently, as the record will show, we presented the matter to this Committee and received a cordial reception, for which we are very grateful.

May I call attention particularly to the testimony during the hearings with reference to the revision of this formula. There the matter is discussed extensively.

The reasons given by Mr. Dodd, who was then Chief of the Division, were that because of the pressure for money, because the requests for assistance had been so great in recent months it was necessary to adopt a new formula. However, the most significant evidence during the course of the hearings is the testimony at page 1254, which I inserted in the RECORD yesterday, when the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] asked:

What were your reasons for saying that you think this—

Referring to the revised formula—is fair and just?

Mr. Dodd replied:

I think it is as fair as any method we can develop, unless it is put entirely on a conservation-need basis.

Mr. Chairman, that is the very basis we have urged upon the Department and we believe and submit to you that is the only basis upon which these Federal funds can fairly and equitably be distributed for this program.

You will note this does not affect the current program. We recognize that the Department has already committed itself to the program for this fiscal year and while we regret it, we do not believe it will be proper or fair to attempt to change that formula as it applies to the current appropriation. But we do feel this would be an indication, if the amendment is adopted, of the dissatisfaction of Congress with the inequitable nature of the present revised formula, and definitely a clear, specific direction to the Department, now that an expression has been made by the House that we should undertake this program for the next fiscal year, that it should immediately provide another formula to govern the distribution of these funds which will justly recognize throughout the United States the actual and proven conservation needs of every State.

Those Members who have had the opportunity to read the RECORD of yesterday may be interested in the States which will be affected by this reduction, and while I will not give the amounts involved I would like to run through the 22 States where the work will be reduced substantially by reason of this change in formula.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, these States are: California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Maryland, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

It might be asked why anyone from Massachusetts is questioning the effect of this formula. I think that in and of itself the fact the entire delegation from Massachusetts, which will receive the same amount under this formula as it did last year, without regard to party, feels that this program should be put on a fair, equitable, and a scientific basis, is a sufficient guarantee of the soundness of the reasons which we have presented in support of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] who has just addressed the Committee of the Whole, appeared with others before the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations and presented, in my judgment, very interesting evidence concerning this important subject matter with which he is concerned. I said to him then and I say now that in my judgment since this is now a soil-conservation program, the money should be expended where it is most badly needed in correcting soil-erosion conditions and in the protection of the soil. That is the purpose of the expenditure.

So far as I am individually concerned, I have no objection to the language which he proposes in his amendment. I do wish to point out, however, that that language has no relationship necessarily to the table showing what would be the distribution of the funds involved which, at his request, has been inserted in the record of the hearings. It would be an administrative matter for the proper officials of the Department to determine as to how the funds involved in this appropriation would necessarily be distributed in accordance with true soil-conservation needs. I am not authorized to speak for the subcommittee. The subcommittee has taken no action with reference to the proposed amendment, but so far as I am individually concerned it represents my view although, as I have said, I am not committing myself, nor do I think that the Department would be committed to any particular formula of distribution of funds by supporting the amendment, nor do I think the House would be committing the Department to any proposed formula by adopting the amendment. It would still be a question for the administrative

authority to determine as to how the funds should best be distributed in order to most truly conserve soil-conservation needs.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, it seems that the administration's agricultural face ought to be red. Here we have now another bill for a billion dollars, and we come in here and talk some more about soil conservation, but doing little. We never had a war food program until 1944. We could have plenty of food. We have the people sitting around the table down at the White House now trying to figure a way to distribute the scarcity. We are appropriating a million dollars for this and another million dollars for that, and it is too bad that the American people cannot eat dollars, because pretty soon it will be easier to eat dollars than eat food. If we keep going down the pathway we are going, money will be more abundant than food.

When we talk about this soil conservation; there never has been any attempt to allocate this money to really conserve the soil of this country. Even during this war the big land owners—and yet we talk about the family sized farm—the big land owners have been getting from \$50,000 to \$85,000, and the big bulk of the small farmers only obtain from \$20 to \$40. How much soil conservation is he going to do with that \$20 bill? That \$20 bill is more for New Deal conservation than it is for soil conservation, I imagine, because at least they get the check out right before election time. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to forgive and forget all of the money that has been spent in the name of "soil conservation," if the American people are now cognizant and recognize that we do have a national soil problem. But they have never really seriously attempted to conserve the soil. We are not making much progress even today. We are farther away from soil conservation than we were 5 years ago, and 5 years ago we were farther away from it than we were 10 years ago. If we are going to build up the soil in this country, there are two bases on which we have to build it. One of them is to build on the basis that the farmer will get enough for what he raises so that he can keep up his soil. That is the first requirement that he must have. The second requirement that he must have, if he is going to conserve his soil, is to be encouraged to follow a system of farming that conserves the soil like livestock farming. Livestock farming has been weakened year after year. Yet millions upon millions of dollars are being appropriated to subsidize soil depleted crops.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the gentleman. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] has an amendment pending. As I understand, the

gentleman is not against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will answer the distinguished majority leader by saying that I am against pretty near everything the New Deal does in an agricultural way, because the New Deal has an agricultural program that is upside down.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not want the gentleman to get into the position now of hurting an amendment that it appears will be adopted.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I see in the Star today that they have O'Dwyer coming down here from New York to tell them how to run the United States. I do not doubt but we will have Kelly-Nash down here pretty soon, and probably Hague. The time must be coming when people will not have anything to eat in this country if this is the leadership. We can sit around the table and talk about the scarcity, but that time is coming, and someone had better be doing something about it pretty soon about getting some food produced. I am not talking about it happening today or tomorrow but in the future. You can go ahead and sell these things to the people, and you sure have sold them lots of bills of goods. I am not saying anything here that I would not just as soon say in my own district.

As my friend from Massachusetts has told you, and as I can show you in connection with the amendment, there is one district in one State, one in another State, and one in another State, each of which received more money than many States.

This money has not been used to conserve the soil; the main purpose of this money has been to conserve the New Deal. It is not conserving the New Deal in a good many places, but that is what it has been used for. If they would spend as much time and energy trying to conserve the soil as they have spent trying to conserve the New Deal, that soil would be in a good deal better shape than it is today and more food would be produced.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time to praise the Soil Conservation Service upon its fine work. The money spent for soil-conservation purposes has yielded value received many times. Money has been wisely spent for inviting and encouraging soil-conservation practices by the farmers, both large and small.

Mr. Chairman, I have checked carefully into the work being done in my home State of Louisiana.

In fact, just before I left home to come back for this session of the Congress I attended a meeting held by the soil-conservation people along the shores of the well-known Caney Lake just north of the

city of Minden, La. At that meeting, representatives of the farmers from every section of north Louisiana attended. I will say to my friend who has just spoken that the representatives there were largely of the small farmers who till the land in the hill sections of northern Louisiana, which sections are proverbially the poorer agricultural sections of my State. They came there and testified to the work which they were doing and the work which their neighbors were doing in reference to soil-conservation practices. They came there to get help, advice, and counsel from the representatives of the Soil Conservation Service who were likewise there to advise and help them in their work to rebuild the soil that had been worn down through erosion and years of cultivation in a thickly settled rural portion of north Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in that meeting. I found the small farmers, some with only 40, 60, 80, or 120 acres of land, who had come there for the purpose of asking questions and swapping advice concerning farming. I can easily see that the money which was spent for soil-conservation purposes has brought much value and much return to our farmers. This portion of our agricultural program will have the benediction of the centuries, and those who come after us will thank the creative mind which has devised and the steadfast will which has executed one of the best programs of this generation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is recognized.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] make very appropriate something I have wanted all afternoon to call to the attention of the members of this Committee.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] has several times stated a fact which should be more emphasized. That is, that the United States has not, for some years, fed itself, yet today responsible agencies of Government have very properly called upon the United States to help feed the world. I think, therefore, I should again call the attention of this Congress, as did the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON], the day before yesterday, and the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], yesterday, to the fact that one-third of the Nation's foodstuffs which go into cans is being jeopardized. I do so by reading a telegram which was received by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], the distinguished chairman of the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee, which telegram reads as follows:

The greatest amount of saving of food that can be accomplished is in the settlement of the jurisdictional labor dispute in the California canning industry. If the last election was legal, the CIO should have been certified as the bargaining agent, whereas if it was not legal, which the Board decided, then the present bargaining agent should be continued until such time as an accredited election is held. Something must be done promptly or one-third of the Nation's annual crop of canned fruits and vegetables will rot in the fields.

That is signed "W. H. Albers," who I understand to be the head of a marketing group in Ohio. This telegram indicates that the jurisdictional trouble in California is not a matter of local interest but of interest to the consumers of the entire United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], is recognized.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I think I ought to call attention to two or three things that need to be called to your attention. Soil-conservation operations are contained in a paragraph on page 45, lines 10 to 19, where \$37,000,000 is appropriated.

The gratuities that are given the farmers are in the paragraph that is presently under consideration, page 46, line 24, to page 51, line 3. There are 123,000 county committeemen on the pay roll for \$23,000,000. The rest of it is parceled out in small allotments. Some of the best farmers in my territory whose soil practices are the best, received nothing. Some of the poorest farmers whose practices are the worst, receive more. It is not an item that really appeals to those who are interested in the farmer, but is an item that especially appeals to those interested in handing out gratuities.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I just want to point out that through all the years I have supported the effort of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], to distribute this money equitably between the large operators and the small operators, but up to this late hour that has not been done.

Mr. TABER. And some of the great big operators have been receiving as much as \$20,000 out of it.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. One hundred and twelve thousand dollars.

Mr. TABER. One hundred and twelve thousand dollars in one payment?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. TABER. We were told a little while ago that the New Deal took care of big business. I suppose that is so, is it not?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That has been cut down since that time.

Mr. TABER. It has been cut down?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. TABER. How big is it now?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The biggest one last year was \$85,000, paid to an insurance company over here in New Jersey.

Mr. TABER. Only \$85,000?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes; they are making progress.

Mr. TABER. That is not big business, is it?

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. RIZLEY. What I am trying to find out, if the gentleman can tell us, is the purpose of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TABER. Yes; I believe I can tell what it does. It provides that the funds

shall be distributed according to the conservation need.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HESELTON) there were ayes 42, noes 28.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of no quorum.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, is it too late to ask for tellers on this vote?

The CHAIRMAN. No; it is not too late to ask for tellers.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MAHON and Mr. HESELTON.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 30, noes 48.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SUGAR ACT

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions, other than those specifically relating to the Philippine Islands, of the Sugar Act of 1937, approved September 1, 1937, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1100-1183), including the employment of persons and means, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, as authorized by said act, \$53,500,000, to remain available until June 30, 1948: *Provided, however*, That none of the funds appropriated under this head shall be used for payments in amounts in excess of those determined by the Secretary to be necessary to provide returns to producers equivalent to those contemplated under the 1946 support payment programs approved by the Stabilization Administrator.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5605) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one, statements, and in the other, the testimony of Gov. James B. Allred before the Committee on Banking and Currency relating to oil.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by the Honorable Henry Cabot Lodge at Middlesex Club, Boston, Mass.

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by the President of the United States.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement on the Hobbs bill by Mr. Fred Brannckman.

Mr. COOLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by the American Plant Food Council.

COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE FOOD SHORTAGES

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee To Investigate Food Shortages may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on butter and dairy products.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, and include articles.

4-H CLUBS

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege on Wednesday morning of this week to attend a breakfast meeting of the friends of the 4-H Clubs, held in observance of National 4-H Club Week, in company with the Secretary of Agriculture, Senator CAPPER, Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma, and my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE]. Presiding was Mr. Thomas E. Wilson, chairman of the National Committee on Boys' and Girls' Club Work, a privately supported voluntary group of public-spirited citizens, incorporated not for profit, to assist the Extension Service of the State agricultural colleges and the United States Department of Agriculture cooperating in furthering the program, membership, and influence of the 4-H Clubs.

Those of us who have worked in such fields as education and correlative spheres that influence the youth of this and other lands have long realized that the influence of the 4-H Clubs is one of far reaching, yes, of incalculable value. Eleven million men and women have had 4-H training. One million seven hundred thousand of our present youth are building themselves mentally, physically, and spiritually to take their place as strong leaders, and strong, intelligent followers as well. They are learning to farm our lands properly, to work our mines, strengthen our homes, use our money, conserve our resources, and they are doing this with stars in their eyes and a deep sense of the privilege it is to be Americans and of the responsibility

that is theirs to this, the greatest of all countries, and to the world.

Two representatives of this fine group spoke at this breakfast. My distinguished colleague the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE], is inserting the talk given by Durwald Lyon, of his State. It is my privilege and pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD that of Jane Chilcoat, 8 years a member of her Maryland 4-H group. I am certain that as you read the sincerely spoken words of these two young people you will feel as I do, that the future of this country is safe in their hands.

RAILWAY LABOR ACT SHOWS THE WAY TO AVOID INDUSTRIAL WAR

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the avoidance of the threatened railroad strike under the provisions of the Railway Labor Act furnishes a good example of the protection the public might enjoy from general industrial warfare. And the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, lies in the application of the principles of the Railway Labor Act to industrial disputes generally, as is proposed in the so-called Case bill, recently passed by the House of Representatives and now pending in the Senate.

Under the Railway Labor Act, a 30-day notice of proposed change in working conditions must be given by carrier or employees to the other. During that 30 days the National Mediation Board, created under the Railway Labor Act, is required to notify the President if efforts to adjust differences break down.

The President may thereupon create a board to investigate and report respecting the dispute, and the strike is automatically postponed for another 30 days if the Board requires that long to make its report.

And after the Board reports to the President, for a third 30-day period the law says:

No change, except by agreement, shall be made by the parties to the controversy in the conditions out of which the dispute arose.

Thus, under the Railway Labor Act, a total of 90 days may elapse during which efforts are made to adjust the disputes before a strike will take place. The Case bill does not go that far. Under its provisions, a maximum of 35 days could elapse.

In other words, the so-called cooling-off or mediation period, which some radicals have called an abridgement of the right to strike, is approximately three times as long under the existing Railway Labor Act as proposed for industry in general under the case bill.

The proposals for settlement are very similar in the Case bill to those of the Railway Labor Act, except that the Case bill does not carry the compulsions for arbitration that the existing Railway Labor Act carries. It will be remembered of course that the Case bill expressly

exempts the matters coming under the purview of the Railway Labor Act.

So to the Nation, which breathes a sigh of relief today over the averting of the threatened railroad strike, I commend the application of the principles of the Railway Labor Act to industry in general.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LaFOLLETTE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

GENERAL MOTORS STRIKE

Mr. LaFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain editorial and newspaper articles, and read from a magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LaFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I charged that the action of the management of General Motors in the strike in that plant was a deliberate attempt to spread the growth of communism in the United States. This is a true observation: That when a man pursues a course of conduct which is calculated to lead to an antisocial result he is either a fool if he does not know what he is doing or a knave if he does it deliberately. Mr. Charles Wilson, the president of General Motors; Mr. Harry E. Anderson, its vice president in charge of personnel; Mr. Harry Coen, its industrial relations manager, and the Sloanes and the du Ponts for whom they speak can take either horn of that dilemma they wish. I choose to take the latter. Having thereby charged them with being knaves, I am obligated to establish that charge, and I intend to prove it.

On Saturday, March 2, Mr. Anderson made the statement that what was involved in this strike was the election to come up in the Automobile Workers Union, CIO, on March 23 in Atlantic City. In the first place, it was a gratuitous intrusion into the affairs of that union. I call to the attention of the public what the public reaction would have been had Mr. Reuther said that the failure of General Motors to make a fair settlement was predicated upon their fear of the action of the stockholders at their next annual election.

I am not the only one who saw the significance of this act of General Motors and who understands the significance of that act. The Chicago Sun on Tuesday, March 5, 1946, carried a lead editorial, which reads as follows:

DOES GM WANT TO BREAK ITS UNION?

If the General Motors management wants to score some kind of "victory" over the United Automobile Workers, and possibly smash the union leadership of Walter Reuther, its stubborn refusal to settle its strike may do the job. But the self-righteous tone of the company's rejection of the union arbitration proposal is not justified by the record. Business leaders with a sense of statesmanship might well doubt whether "victory" over 175,000 workers is worth buying at the cost of embittered future relations.

GM's Vice President Anderson, in turning down arbitration, emphasized that the company had offered an 18½-cent hourly wage

increase—equal to or larger than the raises granted by other automobile companies.

But he did not mention the fact that 19½ cents was recommended by the President's fact-finding board. He did not mention the fact that, with 19½ cents, GM's wage levels would still be below Ford's and slightly below Chrysler's. He did not mention the fact that the 18½-cent offer came only after the workers had been out on strike for more than 2 months, and after Ford and Chrysler had settled their wage problems by peaceful collective bargaining.

Throughout this controversy there has been evident in GM's conduct a strain of half-frightened anxiety to defend itself, to yield no more than was inescapable, to take the offensive when possible—presumably to "teach the union a lesson."

The company reacted violently to the original union demand for higher wages without higher prices and has never ceased talking about this "radical" and "critical" issue. It canceled the union contract—as it had a right to do after the strike—and has since refused any parallel to the wartime maintenance-of-membership clause. It rejected both the fact-finders' wage proposal and their recommendation for reinstatement of the original contract. The union has made important if little-noticed concessions, but the company still refuses the settlement arbitration would make possible.

Such tactics, if pursued long enough, might force the union to abandon the strike without gaining the 19½ cents. There is a limit, always, to the length of time workers can endure payless pay days.

Defeat, if it comes, might endanger Reuther's position as UAW vice president in charge of the General Motors division. Reuther is constantly under attack from leftwing elements in the turbulent union; if GM wants to punish him for daring to discuss wages and prices together, prolonging the strike is one method of doing it. GM's Anderson introduced this issue publicly Saturday with the claim that "union politics" prevented a settlement.

The strike would not have taken place, however, had GM granted a wage increase last November comparable to those granted by its competitors. It would have been ended in January had the company accepted the fact-finders' proposal; it could be settled now on clauses less favorable to the union than in the old contract. The company can scarcely escape responsibility at this late date.

On March 6, Mr. Edwin A. Lahey, a member of the Detroit Free Press Washington Bureau, regarded as one of the leading labor writers in the country, wrote a lead article for that paper. The article is as follows:

HOW ONE PENNY CAN BAR PATH TO FACT AT GM—IT'S VICTORY SYMBOL TO BOTH SIDES—UNION POLITICS PART OF STALEMATE

(The following article analyzes the stalemate that has developed in negotiations between General Motors and the UAW (CIO). The writer, Edwin A. Lahey, of the Free Press Washington Bureau, is regarded as one of the leading labor writers in the country.)

(By Edwin A. Lahey)

The General Motors strike, now 106 days old, is a complete stalemate.

The visitor who returns to Detroit to look at the strike, after an absence of 3 months, can think only of a couple of punchy fighters refusing to fall. There the analogy stops.

In this gigantic and wasteful contest, there is no boxing commissioner who can stop the fiasco in the name of humanity.

In the matter of wage rates, which other corporations and industries have argued out with the unions, to everyone's apparent satisfaction, GM and the UAW (CIO) are a

penny apart. But the bitterness of this strike has made a penny a big difference.

Why is this penny so important?

To UAW Vice President Walter P. Reuther and to his 175,000 striking members of GM locals, that penny is highly important. They feel that if they accept GM's "last offer" of an 18½-cent increase, their fight will be lost.

A Presidential fact-finding board recommended 19½ cents an hour, and after months of bitter relations with the corporation, the union is in no mood to allow GM to have the last word.

To C. E. Wilson, president of GM, to Harry Anderson, vice president, to Harry Coen, industrial relations man, that penny is equally important.

If their rejection of the Presidential proposal for a 19½-cent increase is successful, if they win a strike settlement for 18½ cents, they may conceivably scuttle Walter Reuther's ambitious career as a labor leader.

That project ranks in importance with these gentlemen second only to the resumption of automobile production in GM factories.

The feelings of the GM officials about the fiery young red-haired union official are no longer any secret, even if they haven't been expressed formally. Suggestions have found their way to other CIO officials that the GM strike could be settled if Reuther were out of the picture.

And in recent days GM officials in negotiation have taunted Reuther with the accusation that it has always taken a Phil Murray, a Defense Mediation Board, or a War Labor Board to settle his strike difficulties.

Strangely enough for a union in which political factionalism has degenerated at times into anarchy, there has been no overt break in the unity of the auto workers' officialdom.

This unity has been reflected in picket lines.

The workers have sweated out Thanksgiving, Christmas, New Year's, and now are tramping into spring. Their war savings are about depleted and only a penny separates their union officials and the corporation in the matter of wage settlement.

Yet there is no recorded instance of revolt or threatened revolt against the union leadership in all the farflung locals of GM workers.

Despite the surface unity of the union's officials there is an undercurrent of rivalry and resentment that will break out with a bang once the GM strike has been settled.

One of the big question marks in Detroit today is whether this strike will be settled before the union's national convention, which opens March 23 in Atlantic City.

To anyone who has witnessed an auto workers' convention it would seem beyond possibility that emotions growing out of the GM strike and out of the rival political ambitions of the union's top men, could be smothered.

Whatever the final judgment of the union's rank and file on the timing and the strategy of the GM strike, it is doubtful that Reuther's leadership in the strike will lift him into the presidency of the union at Atlantic City.

(In justice to Reuther, it should be noted that his ambition to be president of the UAW is attributed to him by union rivals, and not proclaimed by himself.)

A vice presidency recently vacated by Richard T. Frankenstein will probably be contested by Jack Livingston, a St. Louis local official who would have the support of Reuther, and Richard T. Leonard, head of the Ford division of the UAW.

Now, what is the significance of all this? I charge that the significance of it is that by defeating Walter Reuther, who, in my opinion, is one of the great labor leaders in America, the truly American democratic leadership of that union

will lose its most valuable member. We have had some queer statements made on the floor of this House about Walter Reuther. I want to correct several of them and then proceed with my statement. In the first place, it has been charged that Walter Reuther was receiving his salary as an official of the union while the union was on strike. That charge is false. He is donating his whole salary to the workers' strike fund. Fulton Lewis, Jr., made that charge about 2 weeks ago, and upon being advised, he retracted it. But I ask, How Mr. Wilson or Mr. Anderson or any of the rest of General Motors' highly paid officials could draw their salaries during this strike of their own making? I hope the Members of this House who have made that charge would likewise retract it. There have been some charges made here by inference that because Walter Reuther went to Russia and worked, he is a Communist. References have been made to a letter which I have never seen, but which I assume is in the RECORD, in which he is supposed to have said in writing to his father in West Virginia where he was born, "Work for the coming of a Soviet America." I do not know what he said when he was young. I am not concerned about the truth or untruth of that statement. I do know that today all of the Communists in America hate Walter Reuther more than anyone in the labor movement unless it happens to be Dave Dubinsky. I will prove that statement in just a minute, but before I do I recall that Shakespeare said, "Hell hath no fury like a woman scorned." Those who know anything about the labor movement in America know there is no fury in the world more than that of a believer in the Communist ideology against those who having looked it over in the past now reject it.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BIEMILLER. I compliment the distinguished gentleman from Indiana in bringing certain facts to light which badly needed to be brought to light. I would like to add just one more point about the false statement that was made on this floor regarding Mr. Walter Reuther. In a colloquy I had with one of the Members 2 or 3 days ago, that Member stated Mr. Walter Reuther had been born in Russia and educated in Russia.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. He was born in West Virginia.

Mr. BIEMILLER. I am well aware of the fact, and the gentleman from Indiana has cited it and already read it in the RECORD, and it should be reiterated, that he was born in West Virginia and educated in the United States.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Now, what do the Communists of the United States think of Walter Reuther? Do not forget, my friends, that Mr. Harry Anderson, who has been in charge of personnel for this company for at least 10 years, to my knowledge, is well aware of the facts I am going to read to you, because he can find them in the magazine from which I read, which can be purchased by any American.

On June 18-20, 1945, the Communist Political Association had a plenary meeting of the national committee. That meeting was held after the French Communist, Duclos, had attacked the policy of Mr. Earl Browder in dissolving the Communist Party and forming the Communist Political Association. The events of that meeting are recorded in the magazine called Political Affairs, described, as it describes itself, as a Marxist magazine devoted to the advancement of democratic thought and action.

Earl Browder, editor; Eugene Dennis, associate editor; V. J. Jerome, managing editor.

May I call attention to the fact that this was before Mr. Browder was taken out of the party. At that meeting members of the party engaged in what I understand they designate as Marxian self-examination. Anyway, they reversed the line. In connection with reversing the line, there was reprinted in that meeting, in their magazine which carried that story, a letter which Mr. William Z. Foster had addressed to the members of the National Communist Party, United States of America, January 20, 1944. Mr. Foster was opposed to Browder's dissolution of the Communist Party. As everybody knows, William Z. Foster is the head of the present Communist Party, which is his business; but I quote from his letter of January 20, 1944, because it is particularly important with reference to the innuendos that have been heard on this floor about Mr. Reuther and at the same time discloses what Mr. Anderson is up to.

I quote:

Perhaps we can learn a lesson from the recent hotly contested elections for the auto workers' conventions when we—

That is the Communists—

in the name of trade-union unity, took a neutral position and the dangerous Social-Democrat, Walter Reuther, almost won control of the convention out of the hands of the win-the-war forces.

They made many speeches at the meeting, many of which were recorded.

In that same issue of Political Affairs I read from a speech by Roy Hudson:

We have played a decisive role in maintaining the unity of the basic win-the-war forces in the labor movement; but an examination will also lead us to conclude that our revisionist errors hindered the consolidation and strengthening of this unity, the deepening of the understanding of the masses and key forces, the exposing and defeating of Lewis, Hutcheson, Dubinsky, and Reuther, and the strengthening, to the full of our relations, with the basic sections of the working class.

Does that look like Walter Reuther was a Communist or that the Communists in America love Walter Reuther? That is what some of the people in this House would have you believe, and that is what the press of this country has been attempting to feed to the people of these United States, because, in my opinion, many elements of the press want to create social discord, class hatred, and eventually class clash in this country, and as long as I am here and this is my country I shall use this forum to denounce both

totalitarians who are attempting to bring on that crash.

Now, after the change was made, the line was reversed and Browder suppressed, Political Affairs changed its description of itself. I read from the March 1946 edition, volume 25, No. 3. It is now called a magazine devoted to the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism.

The editorial board is Eugene Dennis, editor; he was the old associate editor, V. J. Jerome, associate editor; he was connected with the old publication; Alexander Bittelman; Max Weiss; Henry Winston.

The lead article is entitled "Lessons of the Strike Struggles," by Jack Stachel.

I am quoting now:

But, unfortunately, some of the leaders of the United Automobile Workers of America, led by Vice President Reuther, basing themselves on the erroneous conception that they could win their demands through a policy of dividing the Big Three in the auto industry, struck the General Motors plants on November 21. Whatever other motives may have entered into Reuther's consideration, it is now clear that this was a great disservice to the entire labor movement.

Reuther's policy, which was supported—

Now, get who it was supported by—

Reuther's policy, which was supported by the die-hard Social-Democratic elements in both the A. F. of L. and CIO, while it may have appeared as very militant to some, was actually one of right opportunism because it underestimated the true aims of the monopolies, was based on illusions regarding their role. In actual practice it was a direct aid to the employers because it tended to disrupt the common strategy aimed at by the CIO and its major affiliates, and threw one section of labor into battle at a time when it was inopportune to test the strength of labor as a whole. The General Motors workers will win their demands for wage increases, not because of Reuther's tactics, but in spite of them.

Does that look like Reuther is a Communist that some of the uninformed Members of this body have tried to charge by innuendo, if not otherwise?

I insert the balance of that article in the RECORD:

Another weakness in the General Motors strike resulting from Reuther's tactics, was the manner in which he coupled the fight for wages with that against price increases. It is absolutely correct and essential for the entire labor movement and all the people to fight against price increases, for price control, and to emphasize the ability of the capitalists to grant the workers' full wage demands without price increases. We must oppose such policies, as practiced by Lewis and Dubinsky, of entering into collusion with the employers, where the labor leaders advocate price increases to compensate for wage increases. But it is another thing to do as Reuther did, so to couple wages and prices in one industry as to play into the hands of the employers and endanger the strike. Reuther, in fact, continually stated that the auto workers want no increases in wages if it can be demonstrated that they cannot be granted without price increase. We are certain he did not reflect the opinions of the GM workers in such a stand. The correct policy on this question—which essentially is being followed by the CIO under Murray's leadership—is to fight for the maximum wage demands on the basis of the workers' needs, to expose the exploitation of

the workers in the industry and the big profits of the trusts, while at the same time developing a broad, popular fight against the pressure of the trusts for price increases.

I also insert at this point a further article entitled "For a Mass Marxist Party of the Working Class," which appeared in that same edition of Political Affairs.

FOR A MASS MARXIST PARTY OF THE WORKING CLASS

(By John Williamson)

Wherever there was a functioning party—and this meant particularly where the shop clubs had been established and the district and county committees followed a concentration policy—one invariably saw the best results. For instance, in Indiana Harbor, where we had a live and active mill branch, the vote for the strike was 18 to 1. In South Chicago, in the big mill where we have long had influence and today have a branch that functions fairly well, the vote was 12 to 1. In Gary, however, where we were slow in organizing mill branches and in developing party work, the strike vote was only 5 to 1.

In the organization of the strikes themselves, including the picket lines and other activities, a similar picture was revealed.

One could give other examples, for instance, the Homestead Mill, the Cleveland Fisher Body plant, the General Motors plant in Linden, N. J., and several important General Electric shops. However, in some steel mills, or in the General Motors plants in Detroit, where we had no members or had such small party clubs that they could not influence the situation decisively, we saw stay-at-home picket lines, or passive acceptance of injunctions limiting picketing.

I insert this because it contains some interesting information which General Motors knows, of course. I read just a part of it. They are discussing the effect of and the work which the members of the Communist Party are being able to do in the strike situation:

However, in some steel mills, or in the General Motors plants in Detroit, we had no members or had such small party clubs that they could not influence the situation decisively, we saw stay-at-home picket lines, or passive acceptance of injunctions limiting picketing.

I made the charge here on the floor, and I make it again, that Mr. Anderson knew what he was doing, that he is attempting to break down Walter Reuther. He does not care if the people who despise Reuther should happen to get in control, because, of course, it has always been the policy of the reactionaries, who do not want to turn loose of the power that they have, to be able to cry "Communist" in the labor union; to produce the man on horseback; and then to produce strife in the country and to destroy society.

Of course, you can understand why the Communist Party changed its line from that of Browder which was claimed to be cooperation with the capitalists. They do not have to cooperate with the capitalists, the capitalists are always ready to cooperate with them by creating a situation in which they hope to survive because they have found by experience that they have survived, in the first instance, in Spain, then in Italy, and then in Germany. It is a tragic situation with which we are confronted by GM management. A deliberate attempt

to create here another Spain, another Italy, another Germany.

Now, let us see whether there is anything in this man Anderson's background to let us believe that he is not deliberately attempting to foment trouble in the CIO auto workers and that he hopes to create a situation in which the Communist elements in the labor movement in America, whom I have demonstrated by their documents despise Walter Reuther, can advance into positions of power and control.

Let us see whether Anderson is capable of such activity. I will say to you that a man who was capable of urging the use of the notorious Black Legion is capable of doing anything. As a matter of fact, his action in that case was infinitely more culpable than his hopes and intent in this case. We all know that the Black Legion was sort of the bobtailed branch of the Ku Klux Klan. They did not bother much with rituals. All they needed was a few hoods, lead pipes, and blackjacks.

What is Anderson's connection with this? Anderson's connection is determined and proved, not by anything that this LaFOLLETTE says, but by evidence in the record of the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor of the United States Senate, Seventy-sixth Congress, which was investigating under a resolution "to investigate violations of the right of free speech and assembly, and interference with the rights of labor to organize collectively," commonly known throughout the country as the La Follette committee, because it was headed by that distinguished statesman, the senior Senator from Wisconsin, who happens to be the same name and a distant relative of mine, of both of which facts I am extremely proud.

The industrialists of America had in those days, back in 1936, an outfit called the Special Conference Committee, which was made up of important officers of eleven of the largest corporations in America. Its purpose was to fight the Wagner Act and all union organizing activities under that act. Its secretary was a man named Cowdrick.

On page 16784, contained in part 45 of the hearings, we find, taken from the annual report of this special conference committee, that J. M. Larkin, chairman, Bethlehem; George J. Kelday, International Harvester; C. S. Ching, United States Rubber; F. W. Pierce, Standard Oil of New Jersey; G. H. Pfeif, General Electric; Northrop Holbrook, Irving Trust; C. J. Hicks, F. W. Climer, Goodyear; A. H. Young, United States Steel; W. A. Griffin, American Telephone & Telegraph; H. W. Anderson, General Motors; W. B. Foster, du Pont; W. G. Marshall, Westinghouse; constituted the committee.

If you are interested further, let me point out to you that the 11 corporations involved at that time, at the close of business in October 1937 had gross assets of over \$13,000,000,000 and that the average number of employees was 1,400,000, a sizable element, a determining element, of industrial force in the United States. Both their wealth and the number of employees involved have increased enormously since then.

Mr. Cowdrick investigated all kinds of people; particularly, he investigated labor-busting organizations. Included in his files was information about such organizations as the Crusaders, the Sentinels of the Republic, Men of America, American Union Men, Constitutional Educational League, Industrial Assurance of United Industries, Industrial and Public Relation Service, and others.

Mr. Cowdrick, on June 1, 1936, wrote to this same Harry W. Anderson of General Motors and asked him if he knew anything about the Sentinels of the Republic. Mr. Anderson said, "No," he did not know anything about them, when he got around to answering the letter on June 11, but here is the significant letter he wrote. It is on the stationery of the General Motors Corp., it is dated June 11, 1936, it is found in the hearings and the date and reference I shall insert in the RECORD:

GENERAL MOTORS CORP.,
Detroit, June 11, 1936.

Mr. E. S. COWDRICK,
New York City.

DEAR MR. COWDRICK: With reference to your letter of June 1 regarding Sentinels of the Republic, I have never heard of the organization. Maybe you could use a little Black Legion down in your country. It might help.

Very truly yours,
HARRY W. ANDERSON.

(Exhibit 7608, p. 16,945, part 45, of the Hearings on Violations of Free Speech and Rights of Labor, Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, U. S. Senate, 76th Cong. (S. Res. 266, 74th Cong., Jan. 16, 1939).)

If you think that is funny, let me show to you just how funny it is. Suppose he had said, "Maybe you could use a little 'Jew baiting' down in your country," or suppose he had said, "Maybe you could use a little 'nigger hating' down in your country," you would understand then, would you not? You would know then that a man who could even discuss such odious terms or such low, foul standards, or had them in his mind could not even have been facetious about them. So I do not care whether he was facetious or not. I say that by his own letter this man, Anderson, is branded before the bar of public opinion as a monstrous person in the eyes of every decent man in America. That is the man who says and has the temerity to say that maybe what is involved in the General Motors strike is the coming election in the auto workers union.

Oh, yes, Mr. Anderson; you know what is involved in the coming election. What is involved in the General Motors strike has nothing to do, as far as anyone knows, with the coming election. There is no charge, as Mr. Leahy pointed out, that Mr. Walter Reuther has ever pointed out that he wants to be advanced to leadership of the CIO. But Mr. Anderson hopes to hold up settlement so that Reuther is discredited. Having dealt with something as low as the blackshirts, Mr. Anderson has no compunctions now about creating a situation where the "commies" can come into power. For then, 2 years later, when the public has forgotten his foul deed, he can scream, "Communists in the labor movement" to a bewildered public.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If we assume that the officials of General Motors who are carrying on these negotiations have personal feelings against Reuther—I say, assuming that, and getting that thing out of the way—does the gentleman know of any other reason why the strike in General Motors should not be settled when so many others have been?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I have attempted to draw my case, may I say to the gentleman, and, in my opinion, the reason that it is not settled is because the General Motors executives want to break Mr. Reuther and discredit him in that union, because he is the most outstanding, able officer in that union.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman says that is his charge.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. That is my charge.

Mr. HOFFMAN. For the purpose of the argument here we will admit that, but does the gentleman know of any other reason why the General Motors strike should not be settled when so many other strikes in Detroit and in that area have been settled?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. No; I do not know of any other. However, the very fact that I can think of no other reasonable one, contributes to the establishment of my charge by most rules of evidence.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did it ever occur to the gentleman that perhaps General Motors maybe could not afford to pay or perhaps they did not care to have Mr. Reuther or his associates tell them how to run their plant? Might not either or both of those reasons be back of the lack of settlement?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. May I answer the gentleman's first charge that General Motors cannot pay? They had the right to prove, if they had produced the books and showed their operations and their possibilities of 1946 sales, and the mere fact that they failed to do that, having it within their power to do so, as the gentleman knows, being an able lawyer, charges them with having the capacity to do so because of their refusal to disclose whether they could or not.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. May I answer the second charge? The gentleman mentioned two things, and I only answered one. The second charge that the gentleman makes is this—

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I am not making any charge. I am asking a question.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. All right; let us say the question that the gentleman addressed to me. However, in it is implied a charge, I think.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is saying now that if I do not make it directly I am implying a charge. If I want to make a charge I will make it directly. I am not trying to make directly or indirectly any charge, I am just seeking some information.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. All right. I will repeat the gentleman's question to him, and then I will let the gentleman, who is an eminently fair person in the treatment of his colleagues here, judge what the nature of the question is.

The second question, as I recall—we have talked so much now it is hard to get back to it—was that maybe General Motors did not want Mr. Reuther and some of his people telling them how to run their business. I think that is an implied charge. The gentleman may think otherwise. I know of no fact upon which to base that charge.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is it not a fact that for several years now labor has been seeking a place in management, a part in management, that it wants a representative of labor in management? Is not that true? Is not that beyond controversy, even?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. No; just the opposite, I think, is true, and I will quote my authority. I will have to get it and the gentleman will have to accept it. Madam Perkins made a speech about a week or 2 weeks ago which I picked up in the New York Herald Tribune in which she said that labor only wanted wages and fair working conditions, and that labor did not ask for a part in management. If that is not an accepted fact generally, Madam Perkins, who has just stepped out of the Labor Department, should be better acquainted with that fact than my colleague, I think.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Let me call the gentleman's attention to this. What office does Mr. Carey hold with the CIO? Is he not secretary-treasurer now?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. He is secretary-treasurer.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Formerly he was president of the electrical workers, was he not?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Yes. We are digressing a little, but go ahead. I wanted to talk about General Motors.

Mr. HOFFMAN. At that time, I recall very distinctly, in a discussion over the radio and for an hour and a half after the discussion was over, Mr. Carey advanced the proposition that labor was entitled to a share in management, entitled to a share in the profits; and it has been my understanding for more than a year that one of the objectives has been a part in management. They want a man in management.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. My friend knows as well as I do that in no court of law could he prove anything against Walter Reuther by a statement of Jim Carey.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Suppose Walter Reuther did want a part in management. His proposition was that General Motors had the money. Assuming that is true, he wanted to distribute a part of that money as wages. The gentleman will agree to that. My point is that it is up to management to say, if they have \$1,000,000 or \$10,000,000,000, how much of that shall be used for repairs, for re-

placements, for extensions of the business to provide new jobs, and also for research.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Of course, the gentleman does not want me to attribute to General Motors his point of view, either. The gentleman is not speaking for General Motors.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No. I do not have any of their stock and, unless an Oldsmobile is made by General Motors—I do not know whether it is or not—I am not interested in the company.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Since other statements have been attributed to Mr. Reuther, I cannot very well answer the gentleman because I cannot attribute the gentleman's point of view to General Motors. But I am going to answer the gentleman as far as LAFOLLETTE is concerned, and let us make this very clear. The greatest man the Republican Party ever had, a man by the name of Abraham Lincoln, whose republicanism I think I follow, said that labor is the greater and comes first. A fair part of the wealth which is produced by the work of man upon tools which other men may own is the first consideration of any honest, intelligent, socially conscious management in this country today, set aside before all these other things.

I also say to my friend, as far as LAFOLLETTE is concerned—I do not speak for General Motors, I do not speak for Walter Reuther, I speak for LAFOLLETTE—if we do not evolve in America a system whereby we spread the basis of ownership in mass production, industry so that people feel they have a real share in the job they are doing, we are going to get some vicious form of totalitarianism of the left or the right. This is definitely what I think. I have said it before. I do not hesitate to say it now. I do not know whether the development of the union movement in America is strong enough or whether its teachings have been strong enough so that today it is capable of having a right to participate in these decisions, together with the responsibility for them and accepting the responsibility for the errors of those decisions, if there is a real participation. But I disagree with the proposition that a union is an end in itself. To me, a labor union is a means to an end. That is, the development of a democratic capitalism in this country, and that is what LAFOLLETTE believes in.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I think no one disagrees with the gentleman that labor should have a fair share in the earnings. The only disagreement arises in the question as to how much that share should be in each case. The fundamental question, as I get it, which is at the bottom of all these controversies where unions contend that they should have a share in the profits is the question as to whether management or the representatives of labor are to say how much of any accumulated surplus or what you might call profit is going to be used in the coming year to pay the wages and how much is to go into these other things

that I have mentioned. Is that not the issue?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. All right. I think it is the issue. Now, may I answer the gentleman as well as I can. In the first place, the President's fact-finding committee found that a 19½-cent increase was fair. Unfortunately, the President today apparently has said he will have nothing more to do with it. So we have a situation, in my opinion, where the President of the United States is leaving one of the greatest leaders of the American laboring movement with his future in jeopardy, because he refuses to back up the fact-finding board which he originally appointed. That is No. 1. To further answer the gentleman: No. 2, if we are going to determine what reasonable share of the wealth produced should go to the worker, who comes first in any industrial society and a democracy that amounts to anything, it is fundamental that there must be an open discussion involving the prospect of future earnings and an open discussion of the capacity to pay. May I say to the gentlemen before I came here, if I may cite my personal experience, I had a rather unusual law practice. I represented labor unions and I represented a good many insurance companies and some corporations. I know of two occasions where the corporations which I represented back in 1936 and 1935, which were in hard times, wanted the workers to come in and look at their books so that they could demonstrate that they could not pay a wage increase.

And in those days, although I do not think the workers were sufficiently wise or concerned, they said, "We do not even want to look at your books. We would not know whether they were honest or not." I think that made for industrial anarchy. This question of looking at the books depends largely upon whose ox is being gored. I think if we are going to develop the kind of economy in this country that I want to see we will have bona fide bargaining with intelligent people, about a fair distribution of the wealth which is produced and held by the corporations because, may I call my colleague's attention to this fact which is one of the disturbing elements in capitalism as it exists today, if I own stock in General Motors and I wish to sell that stock, no matter what the market value may be, an element in the value or the price that I receive for that stock is the surplus or reserve which that corporation holds. That surplus or reserve was created out of the wealth which was produced by the worker working at the machines. But only the owner of the machine today gets that extra wealth.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. The man who works walks out of that plant without anything after spending in many instances 25 years in the plant and we today are talking begrudgingly about social security. But he takes no share in that wealth, but the stockholder can,

Mr. HOFFMAN. Let me ask you why he does not have a share in it.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Because we have not evolved a sense of justice and responsibility, in my opinion, which will produce a method which will give him a share.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Because he does not own any stock. That is the reason, is it not?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Well, yes. That is the reason. Here is the fallacy of my colleague's argument. I have always said that simply because a man owns stock, which is a share of the tool, that he was not necessarily entitled to all of the excess wealth created under capitalism. I find nothing in the basic tenets of capitalism which prohibits the granting of a portion of the actual value of the total wealth produced to the labor of the man who works in the plant to develop the wealth, or that necessarily denies to him a share of that excess wealth which he produces over and above the wage and over and above a fair rental for the use of the tool.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Surely.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then, it is your argument that the employee comes first and must be paid first. Of course, he must be paid, otherwise he could not work, but he must have an adequate wage or he cannot work.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. And he has a real interest in what happens.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And then there is nothing to give the stockholders and the business is out?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. The business is out, and the tool must be kept. Also the worker is out when the tool is not used.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And the stockholders are wiped out.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. That is a part of collective bargaining also, my friend.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, the gentleman said we should have a system in this country whereby the workers should have security. There is not any reason, is there, under our system and our practice, why any man who is an employee and has a hundred dollars cannot buy stock? It is on the market, is it not?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. All right. Now, let me close.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thought you wanted to educate us. I am sorry I came over, if that is the way you feel about it.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I will educate the gentleman, if he will listen.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But I have listened, and when I get a doubting mind and want to ask a question you do not want to answer me.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I got five additional minutes and the gentleman wants to take four of them. I thought the gentleman was a pretty fair fellow.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will be glad to ask the Speaker for additional time.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. You have taken up 4 of the 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will ask that the gentleman have as much more time as he may desire to conclude.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not ob-

ject, but I hope the gentleman will be considerate of others who have special orders.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I will be considerate. If my friend will let me answer, I will close in a few minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for four additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. ARNOLD. What will be the attitude of labor when the firm for which he is working has losses? We are talking about profits. What will happen when there are losses?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I cannot speak for labor. I think labor today is one of the most conservative forces in America. It has very little to back up on, to risk. It has no reserves, but I am trying to say that if we begin to think about these things, to educate ourselves on these things, if we are to be preserved and permitted to live and exist between the forces of arch reactionary on the right, who wants totalitarian fascism, and the Communist on the left who wants communism, we must work out some method in this country in which if a man is to receive a proportionate share when there is an extra profit, and he has real participation in the decisions that are to be made, I mean real participation, then any man who is worthy of being a man is willing to take the consequences, assuming he has real participation in the decision.

Those conditions do not exist today. I cannot say that Mr. Reuther endorses any of the things that I have said; I do not know, I have never discussed them with him. We got off onto what LAFOLLETTE thinks, and I am saying that because I think I am obliged to say what I think as long as I accept public office. It is one of the responsibilities that goes with holding it.

I want to close by saying that if I were a member of the Un-American Activities Committee, on the basis of the record I have read here, I would call Harry Anderson down here, I would call Charles Wilson down here, and I would say to them: "Look here, what is it you are trying to do when you are talking about the coming election and the strike settlement is being controlled by that, in the face of this record and the fact that you know that the Communists in America despise Walter Reuther?"

I would ask Mr. Wilson and Mr. Anderson: "Are you trying to separate our country? Are you trying to push them, our people, into a class struggle? Are you trying to destroy decent Americans' labor leaders in the United States?"

And I would say: "I want you to answer under oath as to what your purposes are and as to what your intentions are."

For myself, as long as I am here I will continue to fight all men who want strife and hate, because I want to help produce a real, decent America in which I can live and my child and my neighbor and his child can live now and in the future.

Anyone who wants to destroy our chances for such a future is un-American. I charge that Charles Wilson, Harry W. Anderson, Harry Coen, Alfred Sloan, and the du Ponts in GM are un-American! that they are deliberately seeking to spread communism and that the Un-American Activities Committee should investigate their actions.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

MR. ICKES AND MR. PAULEY

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a situation was brought into sharp focus which I believe warrants the close and continued attention of the House—and for that reason I would like briefly to explain it here.

Before a hearing of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee on the question of approval of the nomination of Edwin W. Pauley for the post of Under Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Harold L. Ickes not only contradicted himself to an extent unusual even for the ex-Secretary of the Interior, but in so doing revealed an amazing paradox.

Mr. Ickes said that while he would not necessarily oppose Mr. Pauley's appointment to other positions of trust and responsibility in the Government, he was forced to disapprove the pending nomination. In support of his position, Mr. Ickes said:

I do not think that a man actively in the oil business should be Secretary of the Navy, or Under Secretary or Assistant Secretary.

In almost the same breath, he referred to the Navy's Elk Hills field as a reserve "where a very bad operational project has been carried on from the very beginning." He went on to say:

The Navy has allowed probably 150,000,000 barrels of oil over the years to be drained away from that field. They didn't have sense enough to put down offset wells, protect their own holdings, and no one seemed to care.

Those are Mr. Ickes' exact words—and he is something of an authority on petroleum matters. From one side of his mouth he says no oil man should hold high office in the Navy Department, not only Mr. Pauley but any and all men connected with the oil business. Out of the other side of the same mouth comes evidence that because of ignorance of the subject and perhaps, as Mr. Ickes suggests, "no one seemed to care," the Navy has wasted some of its precious petroleum reserves.

I cannot attest to the absolute accuracy of Mr. Ickes' figure of 150,000,000 barrels. The actual amount is immaterial. If any oil at all has been wasted, that in itself is sufficient cause for concern.

A few days prior to this, Secretary of the Navy Forrestal testified before the same committee that when a certain contract in respect to oil production in Elk Hills reserves had been legally drawn it was sent to a civilian oil man for his criticism and suggestions.

The conclusion to be drawn from these two statements is apparent. Despite the fact that Mr. Ickes and others are taking the stand that an active oil man cannot occupy a top Navy Department chair, it

would seem that the contrary is highly important—that somewhere in the Navy Department, and in the War Department, as well, an experienced and thoroughly capable oil man should occupy a position of commanding authority. How else can the Department adequately and effectively cope with the increasingly important problems which constantly confront these two services, problems which are of vital importance to the Nation's security?

There is no need to dwell on the indispensability of petroleum to America's basic economy as well as its wartime essentiality. Without oil in its many forms the Navy cannot sail a ship out of harbor, the Army advance a single tank 1 inch across a battlefield, or the Air Forces launch a single plane into the air. Nor can ships, tanks, or planes even be constructed.

Sound business and administrative practice demands experts where experts are needed. The Army and Navy both have their own staffs of petroleum specialists, the lack seems to be the absence of an over-all expert in the high places to coordinate and encourage the activities of the specialists, a man who speaks and understands oil in the Navy way. By expert I do not mean any classroom theorist or even any regular officer regardless of his rank, record of capabilities, who has gained his knowledge second hand during his tours of shore duty. I mean a practical, experienced, two-fisted and able man out of the oil business who has been through the mill and knows all the details of this highly complex and specialized industry—such a man as Mr. Ralph K. Davies, Deputy Petroleum Administrator for War, has so thoroughly demonstrated himself to be—such a man as Mr. Pauley obviously is.

In a report presented to a Senate Special Committee to Investigate Petroleum Resources, Senator O'MAHONEY, its chairman, remarked:

What we have done for the war is certainly a challenge to us now, to perform for peace. We cannot rest upon the victory; we must prepare for the future.

The fact that a certain group of both insiders and outsiders is aggressively advancing a philosophy which would bar practical oil men from Navy service most assuredly militates against one vital phase of adequate preparation. It is a preposterous doctrine which can only result in harm to both Army and Navy by perpetually denying them the services of men who most certainly could prove invaluable to their essential activities.

To even intimate, as this doctrine clearly does intimate, that there is some stigma which disbars men of the oil business from serving in executive capacity with either branch of the armed services is to cast a gratuitous insult at an entire industry. Furthermore, at an industry whose members gave unstintingly of their energy and brains that the Allied Nations might have all the oil they required, regardless of the extent of their demands.

In commenting on this, Senator O'MAHONEY said:

I have no hesitation in saying that no achievement in all the history of wartime

and of industry ever exceeded the achievement made by the Petroleum Administration for War.

The men essentially responsible for this unprecedented performance were oil men, of the very same group Mr. Ickes and the others now declare should not sit in the high councils of the Navy Department. That just does not make sense not by any logical process of reasoning.

Mr. Ickes and others so-minded, surely must be aware that the Nation is fully protected against depredations on the naval oil reserves or malfeasance on the part of Navy officials by Public Law No. 343.

I trust that Members of the House do not entertain this same fantastic theory. And I hope that some action soon will be completed which will lead to inclusion of qualified and experienced petroleum experts in both branches of the armed services.

This whole matter is, I am sure, of sufficient moment to command the most thoughtful consideration of all Members of this body.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SHERIDAN (at the request of Mr. D'ALESSANDRO), for 10 days, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1090. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret McWilliams;

H. R. 2748. An act for the relief of the Dubuque & Wisconsin Bridge Co.;

H. R. 3224. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lionel Comeaux and New Orleans Public Service, Inc.;

H. R. 4027. An act authorizing sale of the allotment of LeRoy Milliken on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.;

H. R. 4034. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Alice Yarlott Othermedicine;

H. R. 4035. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Wilbert Keiser; and

H. R. 4269. An act for the relief of Ida Barger, Hazel A. Beecher, Etta Clark, Jesse Ruth France, John W. Nolan, Anna Palubicki, and Frank J. Schrom.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 176. An act for the relief of the city of Memphis, Tenn., and Memphis Park Commission;

S. 1532. An act to authorize the appointment of certain persons as permanent brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army;

S. 1535. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to convey certain lands situated within the Fort Douglas Military Reservation to the Shriners' Hospitals for Crippled Children; and

S. 1637. An act for the relief of Herbert C. Rockwell.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, ad-

journed until Monday, March 11, 1946, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Federal Trade Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Monday, March 11, 1946.

Business to be considered: Continuation of public hearings on H. R. 2390, a bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act. Opposition witnesses will be heard.

There will be a meeting of the Public Health Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Monday, March 11, 1946.

Business to be considered: To commence hearings on the bill S. 191, an act to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to the States for surveying their hospitals and public-health centers and for planning construction of additional facilities, and to authorize grants to assist in such construction.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On Wednesday, March 13, 1946, Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold hearings on the following bills, relating to United States commissioners: H. R. 2460 (S. 346), H. R. 2461 (S. 345), H. R. 2462 (S. 344), and H. R. 2464 (S. 344).

The hearing will begin at 10 a. m. and will be held in room 346, House Office Building.

On Monday, March 18, 1946, Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary has scheduled a hearing on the bill (H. R. 5234) to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to assist the States in matters relating to social protection, and for other purposes.

The hearing will begin at 10 a. m., and will be held in room 346, House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1123. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1124. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of certain postmasters; to the Committee on Claims.

1125. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to mail service on Lake Winnepesaukee, N. H.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1126. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal years 1946 and 1947 in the amount of \$12,816,000, for the Department of State (H. Doc. No. 499); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1127. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to existing appropriations for the fiscal year 1946 for the Department of State (H. Doc. No. 500); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1128. A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, transmitting quar-

terly estimate of personnel requirements for the National Mediation Board, including the National Railroad Adjustment Board and the National Railway Labor Panel, for the period ending June 30, 1946; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1129. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting report of its activities and expenditures for the month of September 1945; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1130. A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, transmitting a copy of the eleventh annual report to Congress of the National Mediation Board, including the report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1131. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the budget for the Navy Department and naval service for the fiscal year 1947, containing estimates of appropriation amounting to \$3,725,186,000 cash, and \$275,000,000 contract authorizations, and in addition, there is authorized the transfer of \$550,000,000 between certain appropriations (H. Doc. No. 501); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PACE: Select Committee To Investigate Supplies and Shortages of Food, Particularly Meat, submits a report pursuant to House Resolution 195, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, on the dairy situation (Rept. No. 1688). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER:

H. R. 5714. A bill to provide permanent additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the postal service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STEVENSON:

H. R. 5715. A bill to provide for the mobilization of the scientific resources and knowledge of the United States for the purpose of seeking the causes and cure of cancer, poliomyelitis, and certain other diseases of mankind; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 5716. A bill to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 5717. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, so as to extend the benefits of the Employees' Compensation Act to conscientious objectors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 5718. A bill to facilitate the liquidation of Washington Railway & Electric Co.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 5719. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 26, 1941, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. Res. 547. Resolution to create a special committee of the House of Representatives to investigate campaign expenditures, 1946; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:

H. R. 5720. A bill for the relief of Marcus M. Schaffner; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. R. 5721. A bill for the relief of Jessie Thompson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 5722. A bill for the relief of Charles L. Cannon; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H. R. 5723. A bill for the relief of Albert (Jack) Norman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GIFFORD:

H. R. 5724. A bill for the relief of the Crosby Yacht Building & Storage Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 5725. A bill for the relief of Sadie Frey and the estate of Marie Hviding; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 5726. A bill granting 6 months' pay to Elizabeth Walter Brown, widow of late Lt. Comdr. Carl A. Bostrom, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 5727. A bill confirming the claim of Cary H. Spurlock to certain lands in the State of Mississippi, county of Amite; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 5728. A bill for the relief of Marian Chudecki; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 5729. A bill for the relief of Albert J. Jenkins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOOD:

H. R. 5730. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Ralph Stanfield, a minor; to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1683. By Mr. BRYSON: Concurrent resolution adopted by the South Carolina House of Representatives, urging the use of South Carolina farm products in the national and world food programs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1684. Also, a concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina to authorize and direct the commissioner of agriculture and the State forester to take immediate steps in an effort to have the Office of Price Administration correct discriminating price ceiling on pulpwood in South Carolina as compared with prices in other States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1685. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of Essex County (Mass.) Commissioners, for initiation of legislation or support of pending bills for amendment to Public Law 346 to provide unemployment compensation to World War II veterans unemployed by reason of labor disputes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1686. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of La Fayette Reed, Legion, Tex., favoring House bill 3960; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1687. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition signed by John Earl Hosmer and 44 other citizens of Silverton, Oreg., urging prompt enactment of the Townsend bills, House bills 2229 and 2230; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1688. By Mr. WELCH: Petition signed by 77 persons residing in San Francisco and nearby cities, for the continuation of the Office of Price Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1689. Also, petition of California Senate Resolution No. 41, re memorializing the Congress of the United States to make a thorough investigation of the United States Forest Service and the basis of its policies for the purpose of enacting legislation which would prevent certain evils and limit the service to the performance of administrative functions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1690. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Circuit No. 6 of the American Relief for Poland, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to aid to Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1691. Also, petition of the Hampshire Heights Citizens' Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to protesting any cut in the District of Columbia appropriations; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 11, 1946

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Merciful Father, in a day so full of change and antagonisms, persuade us that it is faith that nourishes life and hope that sustains it. Wisely and humbly help us to devote ourselves to the just claims of our fellow men. With united hearts and minds, grant us to serve with no thought of reward, to toil without seeking personal aggrandizement.

We praise Thee that from humblest beginnings in our land have come contentment and a sense of well-being, with confidence in the future and a certainty that right will prevail. Give a new sense of urgency to the indifferent, for the hour is earnest and demanding. Help us to watch carefully the things that might annoy or make a rift in the lute that will end in bitterness and disappointment. O guard the portals of our impetuous lips that the words of our mouths and the meditations of our hearts may be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 8, 1946, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4684. An act to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of Guy F. Allen, chief disbursing officer.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 55. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Senate Special Committee to Investigate the Production, Transportation, and Marketing of Wool to have printed for its use additional copies of part 6 of the hearings held before said special committee during the

first session, Seventy-ninth Congress, relative to the production, transportation, and marketing of wool.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1354) entitled "An act to authorize the permanent appointment in the grades of general of the Army, fleet admiral of the United States Navy, and general in the Marine Corps, respectively, of certain individuals who have served in such grades during the Second World War," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. HILL, Mr. AUSTIN, and Mr. BRIDGES to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following Departments and Agency:

1. Department of Justice.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of War.
4. Alien Property Custodian.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 548—APPROPRIATIONS CONTINUED

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 548) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the appropriation contained in House Resolution 387 of the Seventy-eighth Congress is hereby continued during the Seventy-ninth Congress for the same purposes and under the same conditions as authorized by House Resolution 387 of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, will he please explain this resolution?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, in the last Congress the House provided for a limitation on appropriation bills denying the right of anyone to pay any part of that money to three individuals. Those three individuals then went into the Court of Claims. It was necessary for the House to appoint its own legal representatives to defend this action, as the Department of Justice does not represent the House of Representatives but represents the executive branch of the Government. Attorneys were employed and served during the Seventy-eighth Congress and appeared before the Court of Claims. The case was appealed to the Supreme Court. Those attorneys have been working. They did not put in any bills during the Seventy-eighth Congress, although they were employed.

The \$15,000 that we appropriated was not touched, but I am advised that a continuing resolution is necessary in order for the Committee on Appropriations to pay the lawyers that they have employed, and this is simply a continuation of the appropriation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Why did they not put in their bills before this?

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] might be able to tell the gentleman that. I asked Judge KERR, and he said that they had not put in any bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I ask the gentleman from North Carolina why they did not put in their bills before this?

Mr. KERR. Because the case pending in the courts took longer than we thought, and they just did not ask for their compensation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Were the men employed in any other capacity before, and were they drawing money from the Government during that time?

Mr. KERR. Oh, no. These were private counsel who appeared for the House of Representatives. They were not employed by the Government.

LET US DRIVE EVERY ENEMY OF OUR COUNTRY FROM THE FEDERAL PAY ROLL

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, of course I am for continuing this resolution. We are now having it thrown into our faces that there are Communists, who are dedicated to the overthrow of this Government, parked in key positions in practically every department of this Government. They did not mention the Supreme Court, but they might as well have done so.

We found some of these subversives on the Federal pay roll who were dedicated to the undermining and destroying of our form of government at a time when American boys by the millions were fighting on every battle front in the world to protect our country from enemies abroad. We struck the names of those subversives from the pay roll, and certain judges, arrogating to themselves the right to dictate to Congress, held that Congress had no right to take such action and placed them back on the Federal pay roll.

I say it is about time we began to impeach some judges of this country. The American people are going to demand, and have a right to demand, that Congress protect our form of government; that Congress protect American institutions; that Congress protect the American way of life from being destroyed by this bunch of Karl Marx Communists who have flooded into this country in the last few years in violation of our immigration laws, and have wormed their way into every department of this Government.

Every time you pick up a Communist paper you see an attack on the Committee on Un-American Activities. Why? Simply because we are doing our best to bring this condition to the attention of the Congress and the country and to expose those subversive forces that are dedicating their efforts to the destruction of everything for which America stands.

That is the reason for these contemptible attacks on the Daughters of the American Revolution, one of the most